REPORT TO COUNCIL 57
City of Sacramento

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604
www. CityofSacramento.org

PUBLIC HEARING
December 12, 2006

Honorable Mayor and
Members of the City Council

Title: Sutter Medical Center Master Plan **(SMCMP) (P03-090)**

Location/Council District: Various properties bounded by 27th St and 29th St; K Street and N Street (Council District 3)

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and 1) Adopt a **Resolution** Certifying the Environmental Impact Report/Revised Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring Plan and adopting Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project; 2) Adopt a **Resolution** denying the appeal of Service Employees International Union – United Health Workers West and approving the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project; 3) Adopt a **Resolution** amending the General Plan land use map for various properties relating to the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project; 4) Adopt a **Resolution** amending the Central City Community Plan land use map for various properties relating to the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project; and 5) Adopt an **Ordinance** amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Code Title 17 of the City code relating to the Sutter Medical Master Plan Project.

Contact: Jeanne Corcoran, Senior Planner, (916) 808-5317; Lezley Buford, Environmental Planning Manager, (916) 808-5935

Presenters: Not applicable

Department: Development Services

Division: Current Planning

Organization No: 4881

Description/Analysis

Issue: On November 14, 2006, the City Council repealed various Resolutions and Ordinance Number 2005-094, originally approved and adopted in connection with the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project ("Project"). The repeal was made pursuant to a Writ of Mandate issued on September 15, 2006 by the Superior Court of California in the case of Service Employees International Union, United Health Care Workers – West, v. City of Sacramento, et al., Sacramento Superior Court Case Number 06CS00026.

The Superior Court also ordered the City not to consider whether it would reapprove or not reapprove the Project until it prepared, re-circulated, and certified a new EIR in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines.

In compliance with the Court's order, a Revised Draft EIR regarding Project trip generation, parking and construction-related NOx emissions was prepared and circulated for public review on September 22, 2006. The public review and comment period ended on November 6, 2006, and a Final Revised Project EIR was prepared.

On November 20, 2006, the Planning Commission, at a special meeting, conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the Project. In conjunction with its consideration of the Project, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered all of the environmental documents, including the original Draft EIR, prepared in July 2005, the Final EIR, prepared in October, 2005, the Revised Draft EIR, and the Final Revised EIR, prepared in September and November, 2006, respectively.

The Planning Commission certified the environmental documents and approved the following entitlements for the Project: Tentative Map to subdivide/reconfigure 24 parcels into 5 parcels, Major Project Special Permit for development of a hospital and related facilities, Special Permit for tandem parking, Special Permit for a helistop, Special Permit for excess height in the Alhambra Corridor Special Planning District, Variances to reduce yard setbacks, and Variance to reduce maneuvering width, subject to the conditions adopted by the City Council on December 6, 2005. The Planning Commission also took action to recommend to the City Council approval of a General Plan Amendment (land use map), Central City Community Plan Amendment (land use map), and Rezonings for the Project. The Project as recommended is the same Project the City Council approved on December 6, 2005.

General Plan Amendments, Community Plan Amendments and rezones are necessary to accommodate the proposed facilities of the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan. Properties that require General Plan, Community Plan Amendments and rezones include the Sutter Medical Foundation Building, the Community Parking Structure, the Children's Theatre of California, and the medical office building. The amendments and rezones apply to property owned by Sutter Medical Center Sacramento throughout a seven block area adjacent to the existing Sutter General Hospital located at 2801 L Street.

The Sutter Medical Foundation Building will require a Community Plan Amendment from Residential Office to General Commercial for a portion of the site, and a rezone of a portion of the site from Office Building Special Planning District (OB SPD) to General Commercial Special Planning District (C-2 SPD).

The Community Parking Garage and the Children's Theater of California will require a General Plan Amendment from High Density Residential to Community Neighborhood Commercial and Office, a Community Plan Amendment from Residential Office and Multi-family to General Commercial, and a rezone from

Office Building (OB) and Multi-family Residential (R-3A) to General Commercial Special Planning District (C-2 SPD). The MOB building at 2600 Capitol Avenue, requires a General Plan Amendment from High Density Residential to Community Neighborhood and Office, a Central City Community Plan Amendment from Multi-family to General Commercial and a rezone from Office Building Special Planning District (OB SPD) to General Commercial Special Planning District (C-2 SPD).

The Planning Commission action of November 20, 2006 has been appealed by a third party, Service Employees International Union – United Healthcare Workers West ("SEIU"). SEIU's appeal cites the City's failure to comply with CEQA and applicable court orders as set forth in SEIU's November 20, 2006 letter to the City Planning Commission (Attachment 6). As before, SEIU's claims are based on air quality, parking, and traffic issues.

The hearing to be conducted by the City Council tonight is a hearing on the General Plan Amendment, Central City Community Plan Amendment, and Rezonings recommended for approval by the Planning Commission and on SEIU's appeal of all of the entitlements approved by the Planning Commission for the Project. Pursuant to City Code section 17.200.030(H), the proceedings before the city council on the appeal is *de novo*, meaning that the city council shall hear the matter in the same manner that the planning commission heard the matter in the first instance.

Policy Consideration: The General Plan includes specific goals and policies designed to support a balanced system of quality medical facilities. The Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project is consistent with these goals and policies. The amendments to the land use designations are consistent with the goal of a balanced system of quality medical facilities. The SMCS project is consistent with the City's goals and policies pertaining to the provision of medical facilities. The proposed uses requiring Community Plan Amendments are consistent with surrounding uses and would be consistent with the land uses that currently exist in the area. In providing a housing component, the Project is consistent with General Plan and Community Plan policies to provide infill housing. The Project is also consistent with the General Plan policy promoting the provision of adequate parking, and preserving and enhancing historic structures.

Committee/Commission Action: On November 20, 2006, the Planning Commission certified the environmental documents, approved the following entitlements for the Project: Tentative Map to subdivide/reconfigure 24 parcels into 5 parcels, Major Project Special Permit for development of a hospital and related facilities, Special Permit for tandem parking, Special Permit for a helistop, Special Permit for excess height in the Alhambra Corridor Special Planning District, Variances to reduce yard setbacks, and Variance to reduce maneuvering width, and recommended approval of the General Plan Amendment, Central City Community Plan Amendment, and Rezonings subject to the conditions adopted by the City Council on December 6, 2005.

Environmental Considerations: A Revised Draft EIR regarding Project trip generation, parking and construction-related NOx emissions was prepared and

circulated for public review and comment from September 22, 2006 through November 6, 2006. Following closure of the comment period, the Revised Draft EIR was supplemented to incorporate comments received and the City's responses to the comments, including additional information included in the Final Revised EIR. The additional information and related analysis did not identify any new impacts. However, two new mitigation measures (6.2-3(i) and 6.2-3(j)) were added by the Planning Commission and were incorporated into the mitigation monitoring plan. These measures are as follows:

> 6.2-3 (i) During the peak construction period, the amount of construction equipment in use on the project site at any one time shall be limited to the following pieces, or equipment that would produce equivalent emissions:
>
> * four concrete pumps;
> * one tract/tower crane;
> * seven small hydraulic cranes;
> * thirteen welding machines;
> * four boom lifts;
> * six forklifts.
>
> The construction site manager shall ensure the construction equipment is consistent with what is listed above, or that any equipment substitutions does not exceed equivalent emissions.
>
> 6.2-3 (j) The project applicant shall require that the construction contractor retain a construction site manager. The construction site manager shall verify that all truck idling is limited to two minutes for delivery trucks, dump trucks and other construction equipment. The construction site manager shall also verify that engines are properly maintained.

Rationale for Recommendation: The Superior Court ordered the City not to consider whether it would reapprove or not reapprove the Project until it prepared, re-circulated, and certified a new EIR in conformance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. A Revised Draft EIR regarding Project trip generation, parking and construction-related NOx emissions was prepared and circulated for public review on September 22, 2006. The public review and comment period ended on November 6, 2006, and a Final Revised EIR was prepared. Staff recommends the City Council readopt the previous approvals to permit the continued construction of the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project.

Financial Considerations: This report has no fiscal implications.

Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD): No goods or services are being

purchased under this report.

Respectfully Submitted by: David W. Kwong
David Kwong
Planning Manager

Approved by:
William Thomas
Director of Development Services

Recommendation Approved:

For Ray Kerridge
City Manager

Table of Contents:

Attachment 1

RESOLUTION NO. 2006-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING THE MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN FOR THE SUTTER MEDICAL CENTER MASTER PLAN PROJECT (P03-090)

BACKGROUND

A. Based on the initial study conducted for Sutter Medical Center Master Plan project (P03-090) ("Project"), the City of Sacramento's Environmental Planning Services determined, on substantial evidence, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment and prepared an environmental impact report ("EIR") on the Project. The EIR was prepared, noticed, published, circulated, reviewed, and completed in full compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq.*)(CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §15000 *et seq.*) (Guidelines), and the City of Sacramento Local Implementation Guidelines, as follows:

1. Notices of Preparation of the Draft EIR were filed with the Office of Planning and Research and each responsible and trustee agency on October 1, 2003 and January 7, 2004, and were circulated for public comments from October 1, 2003 to October 30, 2003 and January 7, 2004 to February 6, 2004.

2. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the Office of Planning and Research on July 19, 2005, to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the Project, or which exercise authority over resources that may be affected by the Project, and to other interested parties and agencies as required by law. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought.

3. An official forty-five (45) day public comment period for the Draft EIR was established by the Office of Planning and Research. The public comment period began on July 19, 2005, and ended on September 2, 2005.

4. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was mailed to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals who had previously requested notice in writing on July 19, 2005. The NOA stated that the City of Sacramento had completed the Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, 1231 I Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. The letter also indicated that the official forty-five day (45) public review period for the Draft EIR would end on September 2, 2005.

5. A public notice was placed in the Daily Recorder on July 19, 2005, which stated that the Draft EIR was available for public review and comment.

6. A public notice was posted in the office of the Sacramento City Clerk and the Sacramento County Clerk on July 19, 2005.

7. Following closure of the public comment period, all comments received on the Draft EIR during the comment period, the City's written responses to the significant environmental points raised in those comments, and additional information added by the City were added to the Draft EIR to produce the Final EIR.

8. On November 10, 2005, the Planning Commission approved the Project following a public hearing.

9. Two appeals of the Planning Commission's actions were filed, one from Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento ("SMCS") and the other from the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU").

10. The Sacramento City Council ("Council") granted SMCS's appeal in part, denied SEIU's appeal, certified the EIR, and approved the Project at its hearing on December 6, 2005.

11. On December 8, 2005, the City filed a Notice of Determination with the State Clearinghouse for the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project ("SMCS Project").

12. Thereafter, the SEIU filed a petition for writ of mandate challenging the adequacy of the EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"),(Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) The lawsuit challenged the City's actions on December 6, 2005; namely, adopting ordinances and resolutions certifying the EIR as adequate and adopting findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations for the SMCS Project.

13. On August 4, 2006, the Sacramento County Superior Court issued its decision on the merits of the lawsuit filed by SEIU. On September 1, 2006, the Court entered a final ruling, judgment and order. A writ of mandate was issued on September 15, 2006.

14. The Court's ruling and judgment generally upheld the adequacy of the EIR. The Court also ruled that the administrative record filed with the Court did not contain sufficient evidence supporting the EIR's analysis and conclusions regarding traffic-trip generation, parking, and construction-related NO_X emissions.

15. On November 14, 2006, the City repealed its certification of the EIR and approval of Resolutions No. 2005-882, 2005-883, 2005-884, 2005-886, 2005-887, 2005-888 and Ordinance No. 2005-094, excluding any and all separate approvals granted by the City relating to the Trinity Cathedral Project and Sutter Midtown Housing Project which were not challenged by Petitioners. The City's resolution authorized certain aspects of the project to continue, as authorized by the judgment and writ issued by the Court.

16. The City prepared a Revised Draft EIR in response to the Court's Writ of Mandate. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Revised Draft EIR (RDEIR) were distributed to the State Clearinghouse on September 21, 2006 to distribute to those

public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the Project and to other interested parties and agencies. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought.

17. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was also distributed by the City to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals on September 22, 2006, for the Revised Draft EIR. The Notice of Availability stated that the City of Sacramento had completed the Revised Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, 2101 Arena Blvd., Suite Room 200, Sacramento, California 95814. The letter also indicated that the official forty-five day public review period for the Revised Draft EIR would end on November 6, 2006.

18. A public notice was placed in the Daily Recorder on September 22, 2006, which stated that the Draft EIR was available for public review and comment.

19. A public notice was posted in the office of the Sacramento City Clerk and the Sacramento County Clerk on September 22, 2006.

20. An official forty-five (45) day public review period for the Revised Draft EIR was established by the State Clearinghouse. The public review period began on September 21, 2006 and ended on November 6, 2006.

21. Following closure of the public comment period, the Revised Draft EIR was supplemented to incorporate comments received and the City's responses to said comments, including additional information included in the Final Revised EIR (FREIR),

B. The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record of these proceedings:

1. The Draft EIR, the Final EIR (comments and responses thereto) and Appendices, the Revised Draft EIR, the Final Revised EIR (comments and responses thereto) and Appendices, and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference.

2. The City of Sacramento General Plan, City of Sacramento, January, 1988 and all updates.

3. Environmental Impact Report City of Sacramento General Plan Update, City of Sacramento, March, 1987 and all updates.

4. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Adoption of the Sacramento General Plan Update, City of Sacramento, 1988 and all updates.

5. Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento

6. Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, December, 2004

7. The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Project.

8. All records of decision, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, synopses of meetings, and other documents approved, reviewed, relied upon, or prepared by the City Council or any City commissions, boards, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Project.

C. The City Council has final approval authority over all Project entitlements

D. Pursuant to Guidelines section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from, the Office of the City Clerk at 915 I Street, Sacramento, California. The City Clerk is the custodian of records for all matters before the City Council.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Following notice duly and regularly given as required by law, and all interested parties expressing a desire to comment thereon or object thereto having been heard, and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15090, the City Council finds and certifies that:

A. The EIR (comprised of the Draft EIR, the Final EIR (comments and responses thereto) and Appendices, the Revised Draft EIR, the Revised Final Revised EIR (comments and responses thereto) and Appendices) constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective and complete final environmental impact report in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the City of Sacramento environmental guidelines, as well as with the Writ of Mandate issued by the Sacramento Superior Court on September 15, 2006;

B. The EIR has been presented to the City Council, and the Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to taking action on the Project; and

C. The EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis.

Section 2. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 and 15093, and in support of its approval of the Sutter Medical Center Master Plan Project, the City Council adopts the following Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations:

A. Findings of Fact Regarding the Contents of the Environmental Impact Report.

1. Introduction.

The Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), including the Revised Draft and Revised Final EIR, addresses the potential environmental effects associated with a multi-component project in Midtown Sacramento, California. The original Draft EIR addressed the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project ("SMCS Project") and the Trinity Cathedral Project ("Trinity Cathedral Project") and included a programmatic analysis of the proposed Children's Theatre of California project ("Children's Theatre Project"). The EIR also included an analysis of the effects associated with the residential development of 32

dwelling units (the "Sutter Midtown Housing Project"), which was approved separately by the City and addressed in separate findings. (Draft EIR ("DEIR"), p. 1-1.)

Although the DEIR includes an analysis of the SMCS Project, Trinity Cathedral Project, Sutter Midtown Housing Project, and the Children's Theatre Project, the findings set forth below specifically pertain to the SMCS Project and the conclusions reached in the Revised EIR. These findings have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 15000 *et seq.*).

2. Definitions.

"af" mean acre feet.
"AFY" means acre feet per year.
"ARB" means Air Resources Board.
"ASTs" means Above-Ground Storage Tanks.
"BATs" means Best Available Technologies.
"BMP" means Best Management Practices.
"CCCP" means the Sacramento Central City Community Plan.
"C&D" means construction and demolition.
"CAA" means Clean Air Act.
"CAAQS" means California Ambient Air Quality Standards.
"Caltrans" means California Department of Transportation.
"CARB" means California Air Resources Board.
"CEQA" means California Environmental Quality Act.
"CFR" means Code of Federal Regulations.
"Children's Theatre Project" means the Children's Theatre of California project.
"City" means City of Sacramento, including collectively the Design Review and Preservation Board, Planning Commission and City Council.
"CIWMB" means California Integrated Waste Management Board.
"CNEL" means Community Noise Equivalent Level.
"CNPS" means California Native Plant Society.
"CO" means carbon monoxide.
"Council" means the City of Sacramento City Council
"County" means County of Sacramento.
"CSS" means the combined sewer system.
"CWTP" means Combined Wastewater Treatment Plant.
"dB" means decibel(s).
"dBA" means A-weighted sound levels.
"DEIR" or "Draft EIR" means Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project (July 2005).
"DHS" means State Department of Health Services.
"DOA" means the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics.
"EIR" means Environmental Impact Report.
"EPA" means U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
"EMS" means Emergency medical services.
"ESA" means Environmental Site Assessment.
"ETC" means Employee Transportation Coordinator.

"EtO" means ethylene oxide.

"FAA" means Federal Aviation Administration.
"FEIR" or "Final EIR" means Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project (October 2005).
"FATA" means final approach and take-off.
"FREIR" or "Final Revised EIR" means Final Revised Environmental Impact Report for the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project (November 2006).
"Future MOB" means the Future Medical Office Building.
"gpd" means gallons per day.
"lb" means pound.
"L_{dn}" means day-night noise level.
"LEA" means Local Enforcement Agency.
"Lead Agency" means the City of Sacramento, Planning and Building Department.
"L_{eq}" means equivalent noise level.
"L_{max}" means highest noise level measured over a given period of time.
"L_{min}" means lowest noise level measured over a given period of time.
"LOS" means Level of Service.
"mgd" means million gallons per day.
"MRF" means materials recovery facilities.
"MMPs" means Mitigation and Monitoring Program.
"MSL" means mean seal level
"NAAQS" means national ambient air quality standards.
"NBHCP" means the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.
"NOI" means Notice of Intent.
"NOP" means Notice of Preparation.
"NO_X" means nitrogen oxides.
"NPDES" means National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.
"O_3" means ozone.
"OSHA" means Occupational Safety and Health Administration.
"OSHPD" means the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.
"PM_{10}" means particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.
"ppm" means parts per million.
"PRC" means Public Resources Code.
"Project" means Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento.
"Project Applicant" means Sutter Medical Center.
"RAS" means the Radiological Associates of Sacramento.
"RDEIR" or "Revised Draft EIR" means Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento Project (September 2006).
"ROG" means reactive organic gas.
"SACOG" means the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.
"SCAQMD" means South Coast Air Quality Management District.
"SCEMD" means Sacramento County Environmental Management Department.
"SEL" means sound exposure levels.
"sf" means square feet.
"SGH" means Sutter General Hospital.
"SJVAPCD" means San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.
"SJVUAPCD" means San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

"SMAQMD" means the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

"SMCS" means Sutter Medical Center, Sacramento.
"SMF" means Sutter Medical Foundation Building.
"SMH" means Sutter Memorial Hospital.
"SRWTP" means Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.
"Sutter Midtown Housing Project" means the 32 residential units previously approved by the City.
"TLOF" means touchdown and life-off.
"TMA" means the Transportation Management Association.
"Trinity Cathedral Project" means the Trinity Cathedral Project.
"TSM" means Transportation System Management.
"TSMP" means the Transportation System Management Plan
"U.S. EPA" means U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
"USACE" means U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
"USFWS" means U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
"USTs" means Underground Storage Tanks.
"VdB" means Variation Decibels.
"WCC" means Women's and Children's Center.
"WFA" means Water Forum Agreement.
"WTP" means water treatment plant.

3. Project Description.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

SMCS is an affiliate of the Sutter Health System, a not-for-profit community-based health care system that serves Northern California. The proposed new medical center renovations and expansions would consolidate all acute care facilities currently run by SMCS, adding new and expanded health and healing technologies, services and buildings. (DEIR, p. 2-1.)

Acute care facilities presently at Sutter Memorial Hospital (SMH) and Sutter General Hospital (SGH) will be consolidated and expanded into a single, fully integrated medical complex. A spanning structure will allow SGH and the new Anderson-Lucchetti WCC to function as one hospital building. Included in the project are two medical office buildings: the Sutter Medical Foundation Building and a new medical office building to replace St. Luke's medical office building. The new facility at the St. Luke's site will be approximately half the size of the current building (35,000 square feet (sf) versus 70,000 sf). The SMCS Project also includes a Community Parking Structure with connected neighborhood-serving retail and small-scale commercial office space. (DEIR, pp. 2-1-2.2.) Following relocation of acute care services from SMH to the SMCS project, SMCS would continue existing levels of landscaping and exterior maintenance and security at the SMH campus pending implementation of future use of the site. There are at present no plans for such future use.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project site ("SMCS Project area") includes elements on a total of seven blocks roughly bounded by 26th Street to the west, N Street to the south, K Street to the north, and 30th Street to the east. The entire SMCS Project area includes development on a total

of 6 acres. The SMCS Project area, which includes all of the SMCS Project Components, as well as the Children's Theatre and Trinity Cathedral Projects, is located in the Midtown area of the City of Sacramento within the City's Central City District and the Winn Park-Capitol Avenue Neighborhood. The Central City District includes the area bounded by the American River to the north, Broadway to the south, the Sacramento River to the west, and Alhambra Boulevard to the east. The Capital City Freeway, which runs parallel to and between 29th Street and 30th Street, is elevated above the parking lots located along the eastern boundary of the project area. (DEIR, p. 2-2.)

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The vision of the SMCS Project seeks to inspire health and healing through the creation of an environment based on compassion, excellence and advanced technologies. The SMCS Project is planned as an accessible and innovative healing arts facility for the citizens of Sacramento, as well as the region, within an urban setting. (DEIR, p. 2-5.)

The SMCS Project recognizes that the region's growing population will require specialized and accessible health facilities and both of these objectives are addressed at the proposed Midtown location. Additionally, the SMCS Project is envisioned as the hub of an "urban village" in Midtown's Sutter District. It is designed to complement neighborhood features including places of worship, historic and cultural sites, a new live theater, residential development and commercial activity, including restaurants, retail and office uses. (DEIR, p. 2-5.)

The proposed new medical facilities and renovation of the existing buildings (Sutter General Hospital and the Buhler Building) will offer both acute and non-acute health care services, including out-patient care and hospital services at one innovative and fully integrated medical center. (DEIR, pp. 2-5 – 2-9.)

The following are the project objectives for the SMCS Project:

- Consolidate all acute care facilities presently at Sutter Medical Hospital ("SMH") and Sutter General Hospital ("SGH") into one health care complex that will offer high quality care for patients; promote new, highly accessible and innovative care models; and provide efficient, cost-effective delivery of health care treatment for all its patients; (DEIR, pp. 2-5 and 2-9.)

- Ensure that the hospital redevelopment is part of a master planned medical complex which complements cultural, business, residential, historic, and religious aspects of the surrounding neighborhood; (DEIR, pp. 2-5 and 2-9.)

- Complement and add to existing SMCS employee, community and environmental programs including Transportation System Management ("TSM") (ride-share, public transit subsidies, etc.) environmentally-sensitive and energy-conservation design, and practices; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Promote community involvement and neighborhood-building by including community theatre, housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and other institutions that reflect and enhance the character of the neighborhood and by placing the most intense project uses away from residential portions of the neighborhood; (DEIR, pp. 2-5 and 2-9.)

- Redesign SGH to offer the latest treatment for adult cardiovascular, orthopedic, spine, neuroscience, cancer, transplant, medical/surgical and outpatient surgery services; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Expand cardiovascular facilities at SGH to enhance a growing array of leading medical procedures and new treatment technologies on one floor of the hospital, thereby improving patient accessibility and physician deployment; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Build a new Anderson-Lucchetti WCC to deliver both high tech and "high touch" care in a unique environment. The WCC will feature the highest level of neonatal and pediatric intensive care services, pediatric cardiac care, pediatric neurosurgery services, pediatric cancer services, and high risk and conventional maternity services. A life-saving "helistop" atop the hospital building will serve critically sick patients from across Northern California and will be used only occasionally, principally in the treatment of high-risk pediatric patients; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Bridge the WCC with SGH via a unique, three-story spanning structure that will enable the two buildings to function as a single unified hospital building; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Provide additional capacity for quality specialized care at both SGH and the WCC to increase capacity and complement SMCS' twice recognized status as one of America's "Top 100 Hospitals"; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Plan, stage and construct the project in a manner that provides minimal disruption of the surrounding neighborhood and which is compatible with the preservation of the historic character of the area and cultural attractions, including the Old Tavern Building, Pioneer Church and Sutter's Fort; (DEIR, p. 2-9.)

- Complement the existing neighborhood and environment by providing clear way-finding to reduce traffic in the surrounding neighborhood and enhance pedestrian safety alongside new housing, retail and cultural amenities to the extent feasible; (DEIR, p. 2-10.)

- Provide a Community Parking Structure that will provide parking for staff and patients of the new medical center complex and offer parking for neighborhood churches, businesses and cultural attractions; (DEIR, p. 2-10.) and

- Comply with the requirements set forth in California law (Senate Bill 1953) that seeks to ensure the highest level of structural safety for hospital buildings. (DEIR, p. 2-10.)

DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

Construction of new facilities that require specific planning or building entitlements from the City of Sacramento require Design Review/Presentation Board review and approval, Planning Commission review and approval, and City Council review and approval. (DEIR, p. 2-55.)
In addition to City approvals and entitlements, implementation of the SMCS Project could require approval from the following State and local agencies prior to construction, including but not limited to:

- **County of Sacramento, Environmental Health Department - permits for kitchen facilities.**
- State Department of Health Services (DHS) - license to operate New Hospital.
- Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) - building permits for the New WCC, SMF Building and Energy Center and SGH renovations.
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) - review flight path and prepare an Airspace Determination for helicopter.
- Caltrans Division of Aeronautics (DOA) - review flight path and helistop location and issue a heliport permit.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) - Airport Land Use Commission will review helistop to ensure consistency with regional airport plans.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) - issues permits to construct and permits to operate for any commercial and office uses.
- State Water Resources Control Board - issues a Construction Storm Water Discharge permit, WDRs etc.

(DEIR, p. 2-56.)

The City and SMCS have not at this time proposed to enter into a Development Agreement (DA) for the SMCS Project. However, in the future a DA may be proposed, and if so, it is anticipated that this EIR would be sufficient for the purposes of that approval of such a DA.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The SMCS Project includes specific development initiatives for which SMCS seeks City approval. The following is a detailed description of the six SMCS Project components at the project-specific level in the EIR, followed by a program level description of the Children's Theatre Project: (DEIR, p. 2-10.)

Women's and Children's Center ("WCC")

The proposed WCC would be located on the eastern half of the block located immediately south of SGH, which currently accommodates the valet parking site for the Buhler Building, along with the Energy Center, the Old Tavern parking garage and Radiological Associates of Sacramento ("RAS") former medical office. (DEIR, p. 2-16.)

The WCC would be an 8-story above-grade structure plus one level below-grade. The building would be approximately 167-feet (167' - 6" to the highest point of the building) high to the top of the mechanical penthouse and would contain approximately 398,400 square feet (sf) of hospital and medical-related uses, as shown in Figure 2-7. To accommodate the size of the building, the elevators would encroach into the south side of the L Street right-of-way a maximum of approximately 28 feet. To accommodate this, L Street would be narrowed by eliminating the on-street parking between 28th and 29th Streets but the existing bike lanes would remain. The minimum roadway width would be 36-feet, which would allow for two 12-foot wide lanes for vehicles and two 6-foot wide bike lanes. A 7-foot wide sidewalk would be provided along the south side. There would be no changes made to the existing sidewalk along the north side of L Street. (DEIR, p. 2-16.)

The WCC would be designed as an articulated structure with a multi-planed facade. The variation in planes is intended to minimize the overall scale of the building's mass. The design of the WCC reflects the horizontal proportions of SGH to create one unified medical campus. The 'skin' or exterior of the WCC would be composed of bands of off-white metal panels, combined with transparent and patterned or etched glass, creating an overall sense of scale and detail. The building's base would be sheathed in copper and contains planters to integrate the building mass into the landscape. Air handling units, exhaust fans, and miscellaneous mechanical equipment would all be located on the roof of the new building. Illuminated signage would be included on the east and west sides of the building. (DEIR, p. 2-16.)

Helistop

A helistop is a designated area where helicopters can land to drop-off critically ill patients. A rooftop, non-emergency helistop would be located at the southern section of the roof of the WCC approximately 167 feet above ground. The helistop would be used for periodic scheduled transfers of seriously ill infants, children, and adults from 27 counties in northern California and from western Nevada. The general service area would encompass an area within an approximately 60 to 90 mile radius from downtown Sacramento. SMCS does not operate a life flight emergency operation, and the WCC is not a trauma center, so emergency or unscheduled stops would not occur. Helicopters would not be housed, parked, or fueled at this site, but would only drop off patients and return to a remote base, following a flight path directly above the freeway to reduce noise impacts to the adjacent neighborhoods. It is estimated that the number of annual helicopter patient deliveries would be in the range of 200 trips per year, which averages to between 15 to 20 flights per month. (DEIR, p. 2-20.)

Spanning Structure

To meet the clinical needs of the medical complex, the WCC would be connected to the existing SGH on levels 2, 3, and 4 by a three-level spanning structure (crossing L Street) integral to the medical functionality of both SGH and the WCC, as shown in Figure 2-9, Spanning Structure across L Street. In effect, the spanning structure allows the two separate buildings to function as a single integrated hospital. The second floor level of the proposed spanning structure would provide both public and staff circulation separated by a translucent glass partition. The third floor level would contain pre-and post-operative pediatric facilities. The fourth floor level would contain family waiting areas and staff/patient circulation. The spanning structure would be designed to accommodate the 17-foot above street-level minimum height requirement in keeping with the requirements set forth by the City of Sacramento. (DEIR, p. 2-20.)

The existing pedestrian bridge across L Street connecting the Buhler Building and SGH would be removed as part of the project and replaced by the spanning structure. (DEIR, p. 2-20.)

Pedestrian Connections/Vehicle Access

Access to the proposed WCC would be through a private drive and entryway running north/south, located mid-block, east of the Buhler Building, and west of the proposed WCC, as shown on Figure 2-6. This entryway would have one-way traffic to the north with primary vehicle access from Capitol Avenue (to the south) exiting onto L Street. The proposed WCC would include a main lobby, which would serve as the main entrance for visitors and patients to the entire SMCS medical complex. (DEIR, p. 2-20.)

A valet parking system for patient drop-off and pick-up at the main entrance would be provided. Patients could be dropped off at the main entrance and their vehicles valet parked in the public parking lot (south lot) under the freeway. However, ambulatory or walk-in patients for emergency room services could also be dropped off at SGH at the modified existing entrance along L Street across from the WCC. (DEIR, p. 2-20.)

Pedestrian access and access to the WCC are achieved through the use of both spanning structures and pedestrian bridges. Examples include the spanning structure across L Street connecting the WCC to SGH and an enclosed pedestrian bridge spanning 29th Street, south of the intersection of L Street and 29th Street, which connects the WCC with the existing parking structure under the freeway (shown on Figure 2-6). Also, a short pedestrian bridge would connect the existing Buhler Building with the WCC by crossing the new private entryway and a pedestrian bridge would connect the Buhler Building and the SMF Building across 28th Street. These pedestrian bridges would also be designed to accommodate the 17-foot minimum height requirements of the City of Sacramento. (DEIR, p. 2-22.)

Building Demolition

To accommodate construction of the WCC, the existing Energy Center, the Old Tavern parking structure, the former RAS medical office located on Capitol Avenue, and the

surface parking spaces that serve the Buhler Building would be demolished, as described

in Table 2-1 and shown in Figure 2-10. A new energy center is proposed under the SMF Building to provide heating and cooling to all the buildings within the SMCS medical complex. To accommodate the loss of the Old Tavern parking structure and the surface parking spaces, parking is proposed in the new Community Parking Structure. The RAS Medical Office has already relocated to a facility on L Street. (DEIR, p. 2-22.)

Sutter Medical Foundation Building ("SMF")

The proposed SMF Building would be located on the eastern half of the block south of Sutter's Fort and west of the Buhler Building, which currently includes office buildings, parking lots, the House of Furs building, and a single-story structure currently used as a private medical office. (DEIR, p. 2-22.)

The SMF Building would be a four-story above-grade building with two levels of parking and the Energy Center below grade for a building total of approximately 203,382 sf. A total of 131,737 sf of medical office space would be provided, as well as a total of 90 below grade parking spaces. The building would be clad in a combination of copper and horizontal siding, as shown in Figure 2-12 and Figure 2-13. The building would be stepped back from L Street and Sutter's Fort. The building would have an average 33,000 sf floor plate, and would be approximately 82 feet to the top of the mechanical screen and roof and 86 feet to the top of the roof mounted cooling towers. The SMF Building would house medical offices and outpatient services, and would contain outpatient surgery suites, recovery beds, diagnostic imaging, cardiac rehabilitation and a small retail area (approximately 2,600 sf) on L Street. In addition, showers and lockers would be provided for staff and employees of the facility. (DEIR, p. 2-25.)
The existing 18,490 sf Energy Center, located at the northwest corner of Capitol Avenue and 29th Street would be removed and replaced by the new Energy Center be low the SMF Building. (see Figure 2-10). The existing Energy Center currently provides all primary and emergency systems, including all heating and cooling, to SGH, the Buhler Building, and the Radiation, Oncology Center (ROC). The Energy Center includes boilers, emergency generators, liquid oxygen, chillers, and electrical transformers for the buildings listed above. (DEIR, p. 2-25.)

The new Energy Center would be located beneath the SMF Building adjacent to the below grade parking. The new 24,644 sf Energy Center would provide power and house emergency generators, chillers, boilers, pumps and associated building systems components for the medical complex, which includes SGH, WCC, SMF and Buhler Building. (DEIR, p. 2-25.)

Air intakes for combustion air for the boilers and generators would be through grated openings located in the ramp leading to the SMF Building below grade parking garage and flush with the driving surface and through grated areaways located at the southwest and southeast corners of the SMF Building. These areaways extend above grade and are protected by concrete curbs. An additional air intake is located south of the transformer yard, liquid oxygen and parking garage stairwell and forms the protrusion mid-block adjacent to the private driveway connecting Capitol Avenue and L Street.

The cooling towers for the new Energy Center are designed to minimize the release of steam vapor and would be situated on the western/middle portion of the SMF Building roof.

A 20-foot tall painted, architectural, louvered metal panel system is designed to conceal the entire length of the cooling towers from the western views below and complement the design elevations that include the glass storefronts, copper and wood composite siding systems, and stucco base.

The five cooling tower units, each approximately 27-feet tall (including the elevated structural frame and supports) are located approximately 12-feet behind the metal panel screen to minimize their visibility. Depending on the actual cooling tower that is installed, it is anticipated that approximately 2 to 5-feet of the uppermost portion of the cooling tower would extend above the metal panel screen and could be visible below from the west.

The cooling towers would not be significantly visible from the northwest or southwest due to a continual metal panel screen wall and deep setback location of the equipment from the north and south roof edges. The cooling towers would not be visible at all along the eastern side from below due to the deep setback location of the equipment and the same continual metal panel screen.

The existing Energy Center includes a two-story freestanding structure with a basement located at the corner of Capitol Avenue and 29th Street. Chillers, boilers, and emergency generators are located on first (1st) floor. Pumps and a natural gas fired incinerator are located in the basement. Cooling towers are located on the roof. The cooling system includes:

Chillers: Three (3) electric drive water-cooled centrifugal chillers with a total chilled water plant capacity of 1,600 tons of cooling. Space reserved for a fourth (4th) chiller.

- Cooling Towers:
    a) Six (6) cooling towers, 1800 tons of heat rejection.
    b) 52,000 gallons per day (gpd) bleed-off rate (maximum), dumped to sanitary sewer system on peak design cooling day.
    c) 52,000 gpd drift rate during peak design cooling day.

The heating system includes:

- Steam Boilers: Three (3) dual-fuel nominal 400 Boiler Horsepower (bhp) output high-pressure steam generators. 41,400 pounds per hour steam at 125 psig.
- Natural gas is primary fuel source. 50,214 cubic feet per hour (cfh) natural gas input at full load.
- Diesel fuel is back-up fuel source. 360 gallons per hour (gph) fuel oil input at full load.
- Maximum 15 parts per million (ppm) Nitrous Oxide (NOx) emissions each boiler.
- Boiler feed water (domestic water) make-up; 125 gpm maximum at full load.

The diesel fuel storage includes two 13,000 gallon (each) underground tanks. The bulk liquid oxygen includes a 5,000 gallon vertical main tank and a 500 gallon vertical reserve tank located on grade at the north end of the Energy Center (adjacent to the Alley). The main tank is approximately 26 feet tall.

The new Energy Center is designed to occupy two levels below grade area located in the southern portion of the SMF Building. Chillers, boilers, pumps and emergency generators would be located at lowest level (B-2 Level). The cooling towers would be located on the roof of the SMF Building. The cooling system includes the following:

- Chillers: five (5) electric drive water cooled centrifugal chillers with an initial total chilled water plant capacity of 4,450 tons of cooling with a peak calculated demand of approximately 3,175 tons of cooling. Future total plant capacity of 5,250 tons of cooling with an expected peak demand of approximately 4,200 tons of cooling.
- Cooling Towers:
  a) Five (5) cooling towers, 5,250 Tons of heat rejection.
  b) 101,000 gpd bleed-off rate (maximum), dumped to sanitary sewer system on peak design cooling day.
  c) 101,000 gpd drift rate during peak design cooling day.

The heating system includes the following components:

- Steam Boilers: Four (4) dual-fuel nominal 500 bhp output high-pressure steam generators. 69,000 pounds per hour steam at 125 psig. Calculated peak demand of approximately 49,000 pounds per hour (one unit is totally redundant and the other three will likely never be all on simultaneously at 100% each).
- Natural gas is primary fuel source. 83,700 cfh natural gas input. The secondary, backup fuel source is fuel oil fed by a remote underground storage tank shared with the emergency generators.
- The boilers are equipped with burners and controls to limit the NOx emission levels to 9 parts per million (PPM) corrected to 3% oxygen.
- The boilers are also equipped with the requisite feed water and condensate removal and transfer systems.

The underground fuel storage includes:

The new fuel storage tank is specified to be 25,000 gallons capacity and shall be a dual wall construction with continuous vacuum monitoring. The sumps and piping are also monitored and the installation shall meet all required regulations for this application. The fuel is transferred on demand to a series of day-tanks installed in the boiler and generator rooms in the interior of the building, which in turn supply locally to the boilers and generators.

Liquid oxygen tanks are located adjacent to the alley/driveway on the west side of the SMF Building. There is a 11,000 gallon liquid capacity main tank and a 3,000 gallon liquid capacity reserve tank with the associated vaporizers to convert the liquid to gas. The bulk supply shall be in accordance with NFPA 50.

In compliance with current code requirements, a concrete wall approximately 22-feet tall would be constructed along the north, south and west sides of the oxygen tanks. A 22-foot tall metal, louvered wall would be constructed along the east side of the oxygen tanks while a 10-foot tall concrete wall would be constructed around the transformer yard adjacent to the playground area. (DEIR, p. 2-25.)

Pedestrian Connection/Vehicle Access

Pedestrian and vehicular access to the SMF Building would be similar to that provided in the WCC, through a private drive and entryway running north/south between Capitol Avenue and L Street. The driveway would be located mid-block immediately to the west of the SMF Building with primary one-way vehicle access heading north off Capitol Avenue. (DEIR, p. 2-25.)
Pedestrian access would be at the building's main entrance, located along the private drive or via entrances on 28th Street. A small retail space is proposed at the L Street entrance that could also provide access to the building. There would be an underground service tunnel underneath 28th Street that would connect the SMF Building with the Buhler Building and the WCC. In addition, an overhead pedestrian bridge at the second level of the SMF Building would span across 28th Street connecting the SMF Building with the Buhler Building. The western half of this block is not included within the SMCS Project area. (DEIR, p. 2-29.)

Vehicular access to the SMF Building would be similar to the WCC. However, instead of parking under the freeway, visitors/patients would either be directed south on 28th Street to self-park in the new Community Parking Structure, described below, or be dropped off at the main entrance to the SMF Building where vehicles would be valet parked in the Community Parking Structure. A total of 90 parking spaces would be provided in the basement level of the SMF Building. (DEIR, p. 2-29.)

Community Parking Structure and Commercial/Retail Space

The Community Parking Structure would be located on the block south of the proposed SMF Building that currently contains two restaurants (Café Bernardo's and the Monkey Bar), Capitol Physical Therapy, the EAP Building, surface parking lots, and the Trinity Apartments. (DEIR, p. 2-29.)

The Community Parking Structure would be a total of 7 stories above-grade plus one level below-grade. The total height of the structure would be approximately 73 to 83 feet high. The height of the structure includes a six-story above-grade parking structure, as well as an additional floor for a total of seven stories above grade. The structure would include a maximum of 1,100 parking spaces. The Community Parking Structure would provide parking for multiple uses including: patients and staff, restaurant patrons, retail customers and future patrons of the theatre facilities, as well as other businesses in the neighborhood and persons attending Trinity Cathedral. The Community Parking Structure is intended to replace surface parking currently provided on the site of the SMF Building, WCC, and the Community Parking Structure. In addition, the Community Parking Structure would be sized to accommodate the loss of parking currently located in the Old Tavern Parking Structure and the St. Luke's Parking Structure.

Access into the Parking Structure would be off 28th Street and along 27th Street. (DEIR, p. 2-29.) In addition, approximately 9,000 sf of ground floor commercial and/or neighborhood serving retail space is proposed along N Street. (DEIR, p. 2-33.)

To accommodate development of the Community Parking Structure and other

development proposed within this block, the existing Trinity Apartments (includes a total of 5 units) and EAP Building located along Capitol Avenue and 27th Street would be demolished and the surface parking areas removed. The restaurants and the physical therapy business would remain onsite. (DEIR, p. 2-33.)

St. Luke's Medical Office Building ("Future MOB")

Rebuild a smaller structure of approximately 35,000 sf of medical office space. The proposed Future MOB would be developed by an entity other than SMCS. The total square footage of the Future MOB would not increase the overall area from the existing building. A total of approximately 35 parking spaces would be provided below grade depending upon the size of the structure. The 35,000 sf is not inclusive of the proposed below-grade parking. Any remaining parking spaces needed for the Future MOB would be provided in the adjacent Community Parking Structure. It is anticipated an additional 89 spaces would be required in the Community Parking Structure to accommodate the parking needs of the building. The building would accommodate physicians who want to locate near the medical complex, but who do not require space immediately adjacent to SGH or the WCC. Figures 2-20 and 2-21 show the proposed site plan and conceptual building massing. (DEIR, p. 2-33.)

Utility Improvements and Alley Utility Relocations or Alley Abandonment

New Water, Sewer, Electrical and Utility Relocation

A number of utility improvements associated with the SMCS Project components within the SMCS Project area would be required to bring existing sewer, storm drainage, and water infrastructure up to current City code. In addition, upgrades would be made to existing electrical infrastructure. (DEIR, p. 2-37.)

The following is a discussion of proposed utility improvements or relocations to be completed by SMCS as part of the SMCS Project. (DEIR, p. 2-37.)

Alley Utility Relocations or Abandonment on 28th/29th/L Street

To accommodate construction of the WCC, the eastern half of the alley that adjoins the Buhler Building surface parking lot is proposed for physical abandonment. The western half of the alley that adjoins the Buhler Building is proposed for a utility abandonment. (DEIR, p. 2-38.)

The western half of the alley would remain as a service corridor for delivery services to adjacent buildings. All existing public utilities located within the alley would be relocated to adjacent streets. New water mains would be installed beneath 28th Street and 29th Street to replace the water main in the alley. The combined sewer system (CSS) would be relocated to 28th Street and Capitol Avenue and would connect to the 78-inch combined sewer proposed by the City in 29th Street. Electrical services would be relocated to Capitol Avenue and 28th Street. Once utility relocations are complete, existing pipes and conduits would be removed or changed to private service laterals, where required, to service existing or proposed development. (DEIR, p. 2-38.)

27th/28th/Capitol Avenue/N Street Alley

The alley in the Community Block that connects 27th and 28th Streets between Capitol Avenue and N Street is proposed for a utility abandonment. The alley would remain as a service corridor for delivery services to adjacent buildings and to allow parking for Capitol Physical Therapy. All existing public utilities located within the alley would be relocated to adjacent streets. The existing CSS in the alley would be removed. The two buildings to remain along 28th Street (Monkey Bar, and Capitol Physical Therapy) would be connected to the proposed CSS in 28th Street. Electrical services would be relocated to Capitol Avenue and 28th Street. New water mains would be installed in Capitol Avenue, N Street and 27th Street to replace the water main in the alley. Once utility relocations are complete, existing pipes and conduits would be removed or changed to private service laterals, where required, for existing or proposed development. (DIER, p. 2-38 – 2-39.)

27th/28th/Capitol Avenue/L Street Alley

The eastern portion of the alley between 27th and 28th Street north of Capitol Avenue is proposed for physical abandonment, to accommodate construction of the new SMF Building. The western half of the alley, behind Pioneer Church, would remain. The remaining alley would connect to a new private drive running north-south along the west side of the new SMF Building. All existing public utilities located within the eastern portion of the alley would be relocated to adjacent streets. The City's CSS would be removed where in conflict with the new building. New water mains would be installed in 27th Street, 28th Street and Capitol Avenue to replace the water main in the alley. Electrical services would be relocated to Capitol Avenue. Once utility relocations are complete, existing pipes and conduits would be removed or changed to private service laterals where required for existing or proposed development. (DEIR, p. 2-39.)

Water

There are existing city water mains in all three alleys proposed for either physical abandonment or a utility abandonment. The SMCS Project would include construction of a new 8-inch water main in 27th Street (from L Street to N Street), in 28th Street (from L Street to Capitol Avenue), and in 29th Street (from L Street to the alley between N Street and Capitol Avenue). The SMCS Project would also include construction of new 12-inch water mains in Capitol Avenue and N Street from 27th to 28th Streets. All new water lines installed by SMCS would be sized and designed to meet City code requirements. New public fire hydrants would be constructed at the mid-block of every frontage street. (DEIR, p. 2-39.)

Combined Sewer System (CSS)

The City's CSS located in the alley behind the Buhler Building and the Old Tavern building is currently leaking and presents a potential health and safety issue. To address this issue,

SMCS has received ministerial approval from the City to install a new 12-inch lateral from the alley south along 28th Street to Capitol Avenue, then east to 29th Street. This work is separate from the SMCS Project in order to correct an existing problem. This relocated combined sewer would connect to the proposed 78-inch combined sewer to be constructed by the City in 29th Street. A new 12-inch combined sewer would be constructed in 28th Street from the alley north of N Street south to N Street. This sewer would serve existing buildings (Monkey Bar, Café Bernardo's and Capitol Physical Therapy). (DEIR, p. 2-39.)

Dry Utilities

Dry utilities, such as electricity, cable television, and communications, would be relocated as part of the alley/utility abandonments and proposed building construction to accommodate the SMCS Project. New utility vaults would be located in 28th Street near the entrance to the alley. The utility vaults would be designed to meet City code requirements. Installation of these utility vaults could require the removal of two trees. The location and designs for the dry utilities would be approved by the applicable utility company and coordinated with the design/build team. A "Joint Trench" Plan would be submitted to the City for approval. Utilities currently installed over- head in the alleys would be relocated underground in the streets. (DEIR, pp. 2-39 – 2.40.)

Other Enhancements and Street Improvements

As part of the SMCS Project, existing street curb, gutters, and sidewalks adjacent to new structures and site parking would be reconstructed to meet current City of Sacramento standards. In general, existing streets and related curbs, gutters, and sidewalks not affected by construction and not damaged during construction, would not be repaired or replaced. (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

The streetscape within the SMCS Project area would also be enhanced. Streetscape features could include decorative paving, landscaping, and lighting upgrades, as well as improved way-finding signage and circulation assistance. Pedestrian street level circulation and other improvements are proposed along 28th Street between Capitol Avenue and L Street. Signage would be designed to meet the requirements set forth in the City's Midtown Signage program. (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

Landscaping/Lighting/Signage

<u>Landscaping</u>

Landscaping around the WCC would include trees, shrubs, and other plantings. Along L Street, some existing trees would need to be removed to accommodate the new building. Along Capitol Avenue, some trees would need to be removed to accommodate the new building and SMUD utility vaults. Along 29th Street, small trees would need to be removed.

As shown in Figure 2-22, new trees would be planted along Capitol Avenue and 29th Street. (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

To accommodate construction of the SMF Building, two palm trees along 28th Street may need to be relocated within the overall project area subject to approval by the City arborist. New trees would be planted along L Street and 28th Street (see Figure 2-22). (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

Along the Buhler Building some of the existing Lombardy Poplar trees would be removed along L Street and 28th Street. New trees would be planted along L Street. (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

At this time, all existing trees adjacent to the Future MOB would be retained. (DEIR, p. 2-40.) A total of six City designated Heritage trees are located within the project area. Some of these trees may need to be removed due to the health of the existing trees and/or construction of the SMF Building and Energy Center. (DEIR, p. 2-40.)

Lighting

New street lights proposed within the SMCS Project area would conform to the City's lighting standards. New street lights are proposed around each of the new project components. The lights would be spaced approximately 70–80 feet apart. At this time it is anticipated streetlights would be the acorn style lights found throughout the city. (DEIR, p. 2-42.)

Signage

Proposed signage for the SMCS Project includes skyline, monument/directional, parking identification and building identification. The skyline signs would be located at the skyline level on the east and west sides of the WCC (see Figures 2-7 and 2-9) and the east side of the existing SGH. The signs would be approximately 5-feet tall by 100-feet long and would be illuminated. The monument signs would identify the SMCS complex buildings and would be located at major street intersections. The signs would be approximately 10-feet tall by 5-feet wide with information displayed on four sides. These signs would also be illuminated. The directional signs would be pole mounted and would be located at driveway entrances. The parking identification signs would identify parking areas for patients, visitors, and staff. Building identification signs are building mounted signs proposed at first floor levels to identify specific buildings. These signs would be approximately 12 to 24 inches tall and would include the specific building name and street address. (DEIR, p. 2-42.)

Other design elements include decorative paving and other streetscape amenities. Lighting and way finding would be consistent with the City's policies to promote safe vehicle and pedestrian access and egress into and within the SMCS complex. (DEIR, p. 2-42.)

Smcs Project - Circulation And Parking

SMCS Vehicular Circulation

The main regional vehicular access to the SMCS medical complex would continue to be via Capital City Freeway and 29th Street. Local access to the medical complex and throughout the area is provided via L Street, Capitol Avenue, N Street, K Street, 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th Streets. Section 6.7, Transportation and Circulation, also addresses the potential conversion of L Street between 16th Street and 29th Street from one-way to two-way traffic, a project currently proposed by the City as part of the City's Two-Way Conversion Project. (DEIR, p. 2-42.)

To access SGH, Buhler Building, and the WCC, heading south on 29th Street, visitors/patients would have the option to either self-park in the public parking lot (south lot) under the freeway or be dropped off at the main hospital entrance (WCC) and have their vehicle valet parked. Pedestrian access to the WCC would be via a pedestrian bridge over 29th Street connecting the public parking lot (south lot) to the WCC. Once inside the WCC, signs would direct visitors/patients to SGH, Buhler Building or the SMF Building, which would all be connected via pedestrian bridges on the second level. Hospital staff would be directed to park in the north lot under the freeway or the Community Parking Structure. Access to the SMF Building would be similar to the WCC. Vehicles would access the SMF Building via Capitol Avenue. Visitors/patients would either be directed south on 28th Street to self-park in the Community Parking Structure or be dropped off at the main entrance to the SMF Building where vehicles would be valet parked in the Community Parking Structure. (DEIR, p. 2-42.)

Ambulance access to SGH would remain on 29th Street, while general (ambulatory) emergency access would be via the modified existing public drop off along the north side of L Street into SGH. No emergency access is planned for the new WCC. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

Delivery service access to SGH, the new SMF Building, the new WCC, and the Buhler Building would remain off L Street. SMCS currently receives frequent deliveries into the existing basement loading docks under SGH with a total of ten to fifteen deliveries per day. This existing loading dock has several design limitations that would be corrected to allow for deliveries from smaller trucks that would transfer goods from the recently established off-site warehouse, which receives the majority of deliveries. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

Existing bicycle cages and bike racks are located in the north and south parking lots under the freeway and these facilities are proposed to remain. In addition, bike racks would also be provided at the Community Parking Structure. A Transportation Systems Management Plan (TSMP) has been prepared and approved by the City as part of this project (see Section 6.7, Transportation and Circulation for details). In addition, SMCS has recently implemented a free shuttle service for employees and staff from SGH and the Buhler Building to the light rail station located at 29 th and R Streets. This shuttle service is also available to the general public. After several months of operation, the shuttle service has gradually been increasing ridership and is becoming more widely known and used by SMCS employees. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

SMCS Parking

Current available parking to serve the existing SGH, Buhler Building, and adjacent office buildings is shown below in Table 2-4. Table 2-5 identifies new parking to be provided as part of the SMCS Project. Parking for the WCC would be provided at either the north lot under the freeway for hospital staff or in the south lot under the freeway for visitors and patients. A pedestrian bridge would connect the south lot to the WCC. SMCS would also provide valet parking for patients arriving at the WCC. A total of approximately 54 spaces in the SMF Building would be dedicated doctor parking along with approximately 80 spaces in the north lot under the freeway. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

Parking for the SMF Building would be provided in the Community Parking Structure. As will be the case with the WCC, SMCS would provide a valet parking program for patients visiting the SMF Building. Under an agreement with Pioneer Church, a total of 36 parking spaces under the SMF Building would be allocated for employees of Pioneer Church for use during the week while all 90 spaces would be available for church patrons during weekend services. The remaining 54 spaces under the SMF Building would be reserved for doctor parking. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

Parking to serve the new commercial/retail uses to be constructed adjacent to the Community Parking Structure would be provided in the Community Parking Structure. Under an agreement with Trinity Cathedral, a total of 25 parking spaces would be allocated for employees of Trinity Cathedral for use during the week. Staff of the proposed Children's Theatre of California would also have access to 60 spaces for use during the day once the Theatre is constructed. (DEIR, p. 2-43.)

Parking to serve the proposed residential units would be provided in the approximately 40 spaces to be provided on-site. (DEIR, p. 2-45.)

Parking for the Future MOB would be in the 35 spaces proposed below grade as well as in the Community Parking Structure. (DEIR, p. 2-45.)

Table 2-6 provides an overview of the net difference in parking to be provided by the SMCS Project. The existing 249-space St. Luke's parking structure is not counted towards existing parking because a majority of the structure is not available for parking. The upper two floors are closed due to safety concerns and therefore not available. The first level is used for parking during the week where only a small number of cars have been observed. For all practical purposes, the garage is not available for parking and is therefore not considered part of the existing parking supply. As shown in Table 2-6, a total of 890 net new parking spaces would be provided. (DEIR, p. 2-45.)

The City of Sacramento has established a 35 percent alternative transit mode goal that requires all new development that employs over 25 employees prepare a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Plan (Ordinance 88-082). The City-required TSM Plan is required to establish specific measures designed to promote alternate commute modes to reduce the total number of vehicle trips associated with commuting. Reducing the number of automobile trips is an important component to help improve air quality, minimize traffic congestion on area roadways, and reduce parking demand. (DEIR, p. 2-45.)

As part of the SMCS Project, a TSM and Parking Demand Management program has been

designed to ensure adequate parking is provided to serve the population of all the SMCS Project components including patients, visitors, and employees. (DEIR, p. 2-46.)

SMCS TSM and Parking Demand Management Program

The key elements of the TSM and Parking Demand Management program are described below. (DEIR, p. 2-46.)

Existing and Proposed TSM/Parking Demand Management Measures

Previous Alternative Commute Program Elements

SMCS, which includes Sutter Memorial Hospital, SGH, and the Buhler Building, currently implements an Alternative Commute Program. At the time the SMCS buildings were constructed the City did not have a TSM requirement. The current Alternative Commute Program includes the following program elements:

- Free carpool parking (for SMCS employees who carpool together);
- Free occasional parking for those who are full-time alternative commuters;
- Free Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) shuttle program (connecting with SGH and the 29th Street light rail station and SGH and Sutter Memorial Hospital);
- Multiple transportation kiosks (schedules, maps, resources, commute information);
- Employee orientation presentations;
- SMCS Commute Program web page;
- SMCS Employee Rideshare tri-fold brochure;
- SMCS Commute Program Quick Reference Guide for all departments;
- Monthly articles in Sutter Insights employee newsletter;
- Participate with SMCS Wellness Fair and annual Benefits Program. (DEIR, p. 2-46.)

City-Required SMCS TSM Plan

In compliance with Ordinance 88-082, SMCS prepared a TSM Plan for the SMCS Project.

The City approved the most recent version of the SMCS TSM Plan in April 2005. The current TSM Plan is designed to encourage other modes of travel including transit, carpools, bicycling and walking thereby reducing the number of automobile trips. The following commute program elements were designated as TSM measures in the TSM Plan required by the City listed below:

- Half-time designated, on-site Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC);
- Membership in Sacramento Transportation Management Association (TMA);
- 50% subsidy for transit users (Sacramento Regional Transit, Roseville Transit, Capitol Corridor, Yuba-Sutter Transit, San Joaquin Transit, El Dorado Transit, Yolo Transportation, Fairfield/Suisun Transit, Amador Regional Tra nsit, Galt Transit, etc.);
- On-site Transit pass and vanpool vouchers sales at Cashiers Office;
- 50% subsidy for vanpool participants;
- Class I and II bicycle facilities;
- Showers and clothes lockers;
- Personal Matching Assistance (via www.sacregion511.org and SMCS ETC) for carpool/vanpool and bicycle partner matching;
- Flextime;
- Designated carpool/vanpool parking spaces;
- Preferential carpool/vanpool parking locations;
- Guaranteed Ride Home program; and
- On-site amenities (ATM banking, fitness facilities, cafeteria and food vending services, sundry/gift shop, etc.).

(DEIR, p. 2-47.)

<u>Additional TSM/Parking Demand Management Program Elements Added for the Proposed Project</u>

Additional measures included in the TSM Plan to be implemented after project completion:

- 75% monthly transit or vanpool subsidy (up to $100 per month) to provide greater subsidies for regional transit and vanpool users (increased from 50%);
- Class I bicycle lockers – 24 lockers provided in north lot and 7 lockers in Community

Parking Structure;

- Class II bicycle racks – 31 racks at entrances of WCC, SMF Building and Community Parking Structure;
- Showers and lockers – 11 showers and 136 clothes lockers;
- Preferential Parking – designate 10% (62 spaces) for car pool/vanpool/cleaner fuel vehicles; and
- Annual Employee Commute Survey – one year after occupancy.

(DEIR, pp. 2-47 – 2-48.)

Potential Future TSM/Parking Demand Management Enhancements

Additional TSM measures, listed below, would also be available to incorporate into the project as the SMCS Project builds out. These additional measures would be added to the TSM Plan if it is determined, through the annual monitoring program, that further steps are required to reduce vehicle trips to either meet the City's 35 percent alternative mode requirement or to reduce parking demand in order to meet available parking supply.

- 75% monthly transit or vanpool subsidy (up to $100) – to provide greater subsidies for regional transit and vanpool users;
- Monthly Cash Commute Alternative Allowance (bicyclists, walkers, roller blades, scooters, etc.);
- Periodic (quarterly) financial incentives or prizes for active alternative commuters (walking shoes, bicycle gear, tune-ups, movie tickets, etc.);
- Adjust/increase parking rates to be flexible and competitive with other hospital market rates;
- Develop electronic in-house ride-matching service for employees to carpool with other employees. Electronic kiosks to be placed at Transportation Information Boards;
- Track shuttle riders via driver-provided punch cards and offer cafeteria, café, coffee, cookie or other on-site discount for every 10th shuttle trip;
- On-site annual comprehensive Transportation (Spare the Air) Fair; and
- Allow per diem employees to participate in 75% (up to $100 per month) transit pass program;

- Provide community telephone hotline for transportation and parking issues.

(DEIR, p. 2-48.)

SMCS TSM Monitoring and Reporting Program

The SMCS TSM/Parking Demand Management Monitoring and Reporting program includes annual monitoring and reporting to track program success. An Annual Monitoring Report will be submitted to the City by SMCS each year. The first Annual Monitoring Report will be submitted to the City within 6 months of project approval. The Annual Monitoring Report will be made available for public review through the City of Sacramento, and through the City and SMCS websites. (DEIR, p. 2-48.)

The monitoring program will be designed to provide information that will help improve and fine tune the TSM/Parking Demand Management measures and will demonstrate to the City and the community the effectiveness of it's the SMCS TSM/Parking Demand Management program. One of the primary goals of the TSM program is to ensure that available parking is provided for users of the SMCS Project components. The monitoring program will document the project-related parking demand, available parking in SMCS parking lots, and participation of employees in the TSM Plan. The monitoring program will include the following elements: (DEIR, p. 2-49.)

- SMCS will monitor and report the total SMCS daytime population, including employees, patients, visitors, vendors, etc. that access SMCS facilities;
- SMCS will monitor and report the available parking supply; and
- SMCS will monitor and report the project parking demand and employee participation in the TSM/Parking Demand Management program (e.g., transit passes, use of van pools and car pools, etc.).

(DEIR, p. 2-49.)

Parking Resolution

If through the monitoring program it is determined that the SMCS Project demand exceeds available supply of parking, measures will be implemented by SMCS to reduce demand and/or increase available supply. Additional TSM/Parking Demand Management measures, described above, will be implemented, as necessary, to reduce parking demand to the extent necessary to meet available supply. In the event that SMCS parking demand exceeds available parking supply after reasonable efforts are undertaken to expand participation in the TSM/Parking Demand Management program, SMCS will increase available parking supply through the acquisition of off-site employee parking that will be connected to SMCS facilities through a shuttle system. (DEIR, p. 2-49.)

Locations where off-site parking could be provided cannot be specifically identified at this time because the project would be built out over a five to six year period during which the TSM/Parking Demand Management program would be incrementally expanded as necessary. Nonetheless, in an effort to verify the availability of potential off-site parking locations for employee parking, SMCS has researched numerous sites in the Highway 99 corridor south of the project area. Within a distance of less than five miles, SMCS has identified fifteen potential sites that would allow for remote parking, ease of access to Highway 99, and a direct route to the project area by either a shuttle or, in some cases, light rail. The sites range in size from approximately 150 to 250 spaces. If acquiring off-site parking becomes a necessity, SMCS would consult with the City to narrow the number of potential sites. While it is anticipated that existing parking lots would be acquired and used by SMCS for off-site parking (thus, continuing an ongoing use of the site), if additional environmental review is required for improvements to off-site lots or operation of parking shuttles, it will be conducted when specific off-site parking sites are proposed. (DEIR, p. 2-49.)

SMCS Employment Population

Development of the WCC and the SMF Building would increase the employee count within the SMCS complex by approximately 1,394 employees to about 2,633 employees, from a total of approximately 1,237 employees at SGH, the Buhler Building and other Sutter

offices. Because hospital operations occur over a 24-hour period, seven days a week, all SMCS employees are not on the campus at one time. Table 2-7 provides a detailed breakdown of employees on-site by shift and building. (DEIR, pp. 2-49 - 2-50.)

Modifications to Existing Buildings

In addition to the spanning structure and the pedestrian bridges discussed above, below-grade tunnel connections would be enhanced and additional tunnels would be constructed to allow materials and service staff to circulate throughout all SMCS buildings effectively and efficiently. This includes construction of a tunnel between the Buhler Building and SGH under L Street and another under 28th Street to connect the Buhler Building and the SMF Building. These tunnels would be used by plant operations staff and for medical service/support. There would be no public access to the tunnels. (DEIR, p. 2-50.)

Removal of the parking garage, immediately adjacent to the east side of the Old Tavern Building to accommodate construction of the new WCC, would require the existing wall of the Old Tavern Building to be stabilized and repaired to match the existing wall. (DEIR, p. 2-51.)

SMCS PROJECT COMPONENTS ADDRESSED AT A PROGRAMMATIC LEVEL

Children's Theatre of California/ B Street Theatre

The EIR included a programmatic analysis of impacts associated with future development of the Children 's Theatre/B Street Theatre on the block bounded by Capitol Avenue and N Street and 27th and 28th Streets (see Figure 2-1). The proposed Theatre would be developed by an entity other than SMCS, and would be subject to additional environmental review during the processing of development entitlements. (DEIR, p. 2-51.)

At this time, the Children's Theatre envisions an approximately 51,000-square-foot building with two separate theatres that would include a total of 565 seats. (DEIR, p. 2-51.)

The two separate theatres, Children's Theatre and the B Street Theatre, anticipate putting on a total of 11 plays per year, with each play running a total of six weeks. Show times for the B Street Theatre would be evenings Tuesday through Saturdays and afternoon matinees on Wednesdays and Sundays. Show times for the Children's Theatre would be morning matinees Tuesdays through Fridays and afternoon performances Saturdays and Sundays. The Children's Theatre would have performances concurrent with the school year, September through June. (DEIR, p. 2-51.)

SMCS CONSTRUCTION TIMING/PHASING

It is anticipated construction of the SMCS Project would begin in 2006 and be completed by late 2010, subject to obtaining all required approvals. This schedule is preliminary and subject to change as each component of the project moves forward. The following provides a breakdown of the anticipated construction schedule for each component of the

SMCS Project. A more detailed breakdown is provided in Table 2-8 which shows a graph of the proposed construction schedule.

- Construction of the WCC would start in early spring 2007 and be completed by late 2010, subject to City and OSHPD approvals.
- The SMF Building and Energy Center would begin construction in fall 2006 and be completed by early spring 2008.
- The Community Parking Structure and associated commercial/retail space would start construction in spring 2006 and be completed by late 2006.
- Construction on the 32 residential units is anticipated to begin in early 2007 and be completed by the end of 2007
- Construction of the Future MOB is scheduled to begin in early summer 2006 and be completed by late summer 2007.
- Installation of required utilities would be coordinated with the construction of each project and would occur between 2006 and 2009.

(DEIR, p. 2-53.)

SMCS CONSTRUCTION PARKING PLAN

Table 2-9 provides a breakdown of available parking during project construction. According to the construction schedule (see attached Table 2-8), construction of the Community Parking Structure will be completed before the WCC and the SMF Building are completed. A total of 2,096 parking spaces are currently available to serve visitors, patients, and staff of the SMCS, as well as residents and patrons to the various restaurants and businesses in the area. As shown in Table 2-9, once construction is complete a total of 2,792 spaces would be available to serve visitors, patients, staff, residents and patrons to the area. (DEIR, p. 2-53.)

During construction activities, materials and equipment are anticipated to be stored and staged in the northeast corner of the Community Block. The EAP Building, owned by SMCS, would be used by the construction company during construction activities. It is anticipated this building would be demolished at the end of the project. (DEIR, p. 2-53.)

4. Additional Background Related to Project.

PROJECT APPLICANT AND PROJECT AREA

SMCS is an affiliate of the Sutter Health System, a not-for-profit community-based health care system that serves Northern California. The proposed new medical center renovations and expansions would consolidate all acute care facilities currently run by

SMCS, adding new and expanded health and healing technologies, services and buildings. (DEIR, p. 2-1.)

The SMCS Project area encompasses a geographic area that is roughly bounded by 26th Street to the west, N Street to the south, K Street to the north, and 30th Street to the east, shown in Figure 4-1. (DEIR, p. 4-1.) The entire project area includes development on a total of six (6) acres, spanning a total of seven (7) blocks. (DEIR, p. 2-2.) The project area includes the following elements within the seven (7) blocks: SGH, WCC, proposed SMF Building site, proposed Community Parking Structure and Retail/Commercial site and two blocks containing existing parking lots leased from Caltrans. (DEIR, p. 4-3.)

Existing land uses in the project vicinity include medical offices, Regional Transit (RT) service center, restaurants, churches, Sutter's Fort State Historic Park, small apartment buildings, a senior housing project, older Victorian residences, and office space. See Figure 2-1 in Chapter 2, Project Description, which identifies existing land uses in the vicinity of the project area. (DEIR, pp. 2-2 and 4-3.)

On adjacent blocks, existing uses generally to the north of the project site include medical office buildings across K Street from SGH and Sutter's Fort, north of L Street, between 26th and 28th Streets, as shown in Figure 2-3, Existing Adjacent Uses. On the block bounded by 26th and 27th Streets and L Street and Capitol Avenue, there are residential uses and office uses, and on the block between Capitol Avenue and N Street west of 26 th are residential uses. South of the project area, south of N Street, there are residential uses and some offices, some of which are vacant, and restaurant uses at the corner of N Street

and 28th Street. The Regional Transit maintenance facility is on the east side of 28th Street, between N Street and Capitol Avenue. (DEIR, p. 2-5.)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The City prepared an EIR to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, as well as to provide decision-makers and the public with information to enable them to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed actions. (DEIR, p. 1-4.) The EIR provides a project-level analysis for the SMCS Project and a programmatic analysis of the Children's Theatre of California. (DEIR, p. 1-4.)

As a first step in complying with the procedural requirements of CEQA, the City examined whether any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment. It was determined that there were potentially significant impacts and the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") indicated that an EIR would be prepared to analyze these impacts. (DEIR, p. 1-8.)

The scope of the EIR includes environmental issues determined to be potentially significant through preparation of the NOP, Revised NOP, responses to the NOP, scoping meetings, and discussions among the public, consulting staff, and the City of Sacramento. The City filed a NOP with the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) as an indication that an EIR would be prepared. During preparation of the EIR, agencies, organizations, and persons who the City believed might have an interest in this project were notified. (DEIR, p. 1-8.)

A Notice of Completion (NOC) of the EIR was published on July 15, 2005 and distributed to agencies that commented on the NOP, responsible and trustee agencies, individuals and organizations requesting notice, surrounding cities, counties, and other interested parties for a 45-day public review period in accordance with section 15087 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (DEIR, p. 1-8.) The Draft EIR was published and circulated for public comment from July 15, 2005 to September 9, 2005.

Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all comments raised with respect to environmental issues were prepared and incorporated into the Final EIR ("FEIR"), released on or about October 11, 2005. Written responses to comments received from any State or local agencies were made available to these agencies at least ten days prior to the first public hearing during which the certification of the EIR was considered. (Pub. Resources Code §21092.5, subd. (a).) These comments and their responses were included in the FEIR for consideration and certification by the Design Review and Preservation Board, Planning Commission, and City Council. On November 10, 2005, the Planning Commission approved the project following a public hearing. At a hearing on December 6, 2005, the City Council approved the SMCS project and certified the EIR as adequate under CEQA.

SEIU filed a petition for writ of mandate in the Sacramento County Superior Court challenging the City's approval of the SMCS project and certification of the EIR. On September 1, 2006, the Court issued a ruling and filed a judgment (See RDEIR, Appendix A). The Court's ruling and judgment generally upheld the adequacy of the EIR. The Court granted the writ of mandate on the grounds that the administrative record filed with the

Court did not contain sufficient evidence supporting the EIR's analysis and conclusions regarding traffic-trip generation, parking, and construction related NOX emissions. (RDEIR, pp. 1-1 thru 1-2.)

In response to the writ of mandate issued on September 15, 2006, the City prepared and circulated for public review and comment, a Revised Draft EIR (September 2006). A Notice of Availability ("NOA") of the Revised Draft EIR was published on or about September 22, 2006. The information contained in the RDEIR supplements the additional analysis and technical information contained in the 2005 EIR, including the underlying data of the analysis set forth in the EIR regarding traffic trip generation, parking, and construction-related air quality (NO_X) impacts of the SMCS project. The RDEIR is therefore intended to respond to the problems identified in the Court's ruling and judgment, and the writ of mandate on September 15, 2006, in *SEIU v. City of Sacramento* (Case No. 06CS00026). (RDEIR, p. 1-2.)

The Revised Draft EIR includes only those portions of the original EIR (2005) that were revised in order to provide the additional information required by the judgment. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21168.9; CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5.) First, in response to the Court's decision, the URBEMIS air modeling outputs for construction related NOx were re-modeled with more precise information pertaining to construction equipment. The text of Impact 6.2-3 has been revised to reflect this new modeling information. (RDEIR, p. 1-3.) Second, to address trip generation, the "Methods of Analysis" section in the Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR was revised to include a more thorough explanation of the data and methods used to determine the trip generation associated with the Project. (RDEIR, pp. 1-3 through 1-4.) Third, the parking count data sheets have been included in the RDEIR along with a more thorough explanation of the process that was followed to obtain that information. (RDEIR, p. 1-4.) The RDEIR also includes technical reports providing further information on these issues.

The Revised Draft EIR should be reviewed in conjunction with the 2005 Final EIR. As further provided for in Section 15088.5(f)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, only comments limited to the additional information provided in the RDEIR were considered by the City. (RDEIR, p. 1-4.)

In compliance with CEQA, the Revised Draft EIR was circulated between September 22, 2006 to November 6, 2006 for 45 days for review and comment by local, responsible and trustee agencies, interested organizations and individuals. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, written responses to all comments raised with respect to environmental issues discussed in the Revised Draft EIR were prepared and incorporated into the Final Revised EIR (FREIR). The City did not respond to comments submitted after the deadline set forth in the Notice of Availability. Written responses to comments received from any state or local agencies were made available to those agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the City will consider whether to certify the FREIR and approve the SMCS Project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21092.5 subd. (a).) These comments and responses were included in the FREIR for consideration by the City. The City will not consider whether to reapprove the Project unless and until the City first certifies the FREIR. (RDEIR, pp. 1-4, 1-5.)

According to Public Resources Code Section 21081, no public agency shall approve or

carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment without making specific Findings of Fact (Findings). The purpose of the Findings is to establish the connection between the analysis in the EIR and the action of the Lead Agency with regard to approval or rejection of the project. Prior to approval of a project, one of three findings must be made, as follows: (DEIR, p. 1-9.)

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

(DEIR, p. 1-9.)

Additionally, according to PRC section 21081.6, for projects in which significant impacts will be avoided by mitigation measures, the Lead Agency must include a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). The purpose of the MMP is to ensure compliance with required mitigation during implementation of the project. (DEIR, p. 1-9.)

If a project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts, an agency must state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project based on the FEIR and any other information in the public record. This is termed a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" and is used to explain the specific reasons why the benefits of a proposed project make its unavoidable environmental effects acceptable. The statement is prepared before action is taken to approve the project and certify the EIR and is included as part of these findings.

No specific areas of concern relating to land use or planning issues were raised in comment letters received in response to either the first NOP or the Revised NOP. The Initial Study determined that no agricultural resources would be significantly impacted by the SMCS Project or the Trinity Cathedral Project. Therefore, these issues were not discussed further in the EIR. (DEIR, p. 4-1.) Changes were made to the Final EIR in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, however.

The official custodian of the record is the City of Sacramento Development Services Department, Environmental Planning Services, 2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95834.

B. Findings of Fact for Approval Required under CEQA.

INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" (Emphasis added.) The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects." (Emphasis added.) In the event that specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.)

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that "[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The second permissible finding is that "[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2).) The third potential conclusion is that "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3).)

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* ("*Goleta II*") (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565; *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 ("feasibility" also encompasses desirability to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors and whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project).)

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the

project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

These findings constitute the City's best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the City hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when either the Design Review Board, Planning Commission or City Council adopts resolution(s) or ordinance(s) approving the Project.

POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The EIR identifies a number of potentially significant environmental effects (or "impacts") that the Project will cause. Some of these significant effects can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other effects cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, and thus will be significant and unavoidable. Some of these unavoidable significant effects can be substantially lessened by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other significant, unavoidable effects cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. For reasons set forth in Section X *infra*, however, the City has determined that the significant, unavoidable effects of the Project are outweighed by overriding economic, social, and other considerations.

1. AESTHETICS

Impact 6.1-1: Implementation of the SMCS Project could be visually incompatible with the mass, scale, or character of existing development in the vicinity of the project area. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.1-18.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3),

15091.) Nevertheless, voluntary measures have been incorporated into the project to ensure that the potential effects of the project remain less than significant.

Explanation:

SMCS Project

All of the components of the SMCS Project are subject to the Central City Neighborhood Design Guidelines, as well as the Design Guidelines and will be reviewed by the City's Design Review and Preservation Board. (DEIR, p. 6.1-18.) For example, the SMCS Project would include multiple exterior sign types used for wayfinding, identification and regulatory requirements within the project area.

Monument-style signs would be located at ground level and would identify the medical complex boundaries and provide directional information to major buildings or services. Each monument-style sign would include the SMCS name on top and would display directional information to the various buildings and departments, for example: Emergency

Room, WCC, Sutter Medical Foundation Building, and Buhler Building. These signs would be four-sided with information on all sides including multi-lingual text. They would be placed at each major decision-making corner throughout the complex and would be internally illuminated for night viewing. Monument-style sign massing would be approximately 10 feet in height and five feet wide per side. (DEIR, p. 6.1-18 – 6.1-19.)

Vehicular-directional signage would be monument-style signs that would be placed at individual driveways into the WCC and SMF Building. These two-sided signs would be illuminated and would stand 10 feet in height and five feet wide. (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

Attractive parking-identification style signs would mark entries into parking areas and would also be placed to clearly identify Valet Parking services at specific buildings. The parking signs would be low in profile and could be single or double post and panel signs that would be five to six feet in height. (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

Women's and Children's Center

The WCC is an 8-story above-grade structure, approximately 167 feet high to the top of the mechanical penthouse. Construction of the WCC would replace views of the existing Energy Center, the Old Tavern parking structure, the (former) RAS medical office, and the existing surface parking lot (see Figure 6.1-10). (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

The WCC would be designed as an articulated structure with a multi-planed facade. The variation in planes is intended to minimize the overall scale of the building's mass. The design of the WCC and the horizontal proportions of Sutter General Hospital will create a unified medical complex. The exterior of the WCC would be composed of bands of off-white metal panels, combined with transparent and patterned or etched glass, creating an overall sense of scale and detail. The building's base would be sheathed in copper and would contain planters to integrate the building mass into the landscape. Air handling units, exhaust fans, and miscellaneous mechanical equipment would all be located on the roof of the new building. The main entrance to the WCC would be to the west of the building through a private drive and entryway running north/south between the WCC and the Buhler Building (see Figure 2-6 in Chapter 2, Project Description). (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

The WCC would be connected to the existing SGH by a three-level spanning structure on levels 2, 3, and 4. The spanning structure would cross L Street from the north side of the WCC to the south side of SGH. Currently a pedestrian bridge spans across L Street on the western edge of the block from SGH to the Buhler Building. This one-story-tall bridge would be removed, and the new three-story spanning structure would be located closer to 29th Street (see Figure 6.1-11). In addition to the spanning structure across L Street, one enclosed pedestrian bridge would span 29th Street, south of the intersection of L and 29th

Streets, connecting the WCC with the existing parking structure under the freeway. Another pedestrian bridge would span the private drive between the WCC and the Buhler Building connecting the two buildings. (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

Similar to the existing SGH and Buhler Building, the proposed WCC would be visible to traffic on the elevated Capital City Freeway to the east. The new building would replace existing views of the Buhler Building from the freeway and from 29th Street looking west. Looking east from Sutter's Fort and L Street, the top of the WCC would be visible above the Buhler Building. Views from Sutter's Fort would be consistent with existing views to the east that currently include SGH, the Buhler Building and the existing bridge between the two buildings. (DEIR, p. 6.1-19.)

The most notable visual change due to construction of the new WCC would be from 28th Street and Capitol Avenue, viewing the new building against the existing Old Tavern Building. Existing views consist of the Old Tavern parking structure and former medical office buildings, which are similar in scale to the Old Tavern Building (see Figure 6.1-5). The parking structure currently abuts and is lower than the Old Tavern Building and is lower than the four-story building. The new WCC would be separated from the Old Tavern Building with the private drive (Motor Court) and entryway between the two buildings, but it would be substantially taller, with a larger mass and scale (see Figure 6.1-12). (DEIR, p. 6.1-22.)

SMF Building

The SMF Building would replace existing views of surface parking lots, the House of Furs building, a single-story private medical office building, and the two-story MTI office buildings with a four-story above-grade, approximately 82-foot-high building (see Figure 6.1-6). The SMF Building exterior would include a combination of copper and horizontal siding with large windows on the second floor. The building would include ground-floor retail on L Street. The building would be stepped back from L Street and Sutter's Fort to reduce visual impacts on the historic Sutter's Fort complex and the adjacent Pioneer Church (see Figure 6.1-13). The SMF Building would also include the relocated Energy Center for the SMCS Project. Most of the Energy Center facilities would be located below-grade on the southern portion of the building and would not be visible. Above-grade components would include extensions of the air intakes for combustion air and exhaust stacks along the west side of the roof of the Energy Center. An oxygen tank would be located just west of the above-grade air intake approximately mid-block. The cooling towers would be approximately 27 feet tall. The cooling towers would be located on the roof of the SMF Building in a location that would not be visible from street level. (DEIR, p. 6.1-22.)

The current view to the south from the Sutter's Fort entrance on L Street consists of Pioneer Church and the painted fence surrounding a surface parking lot on L and 28th Streets. Because the painted fence is less than one story tall, the current view to the south also includes the trees and office buildings on the southern half of the City block. (DEIR, p. 6.1-22.)

The new SMF Building would replace existing views from L Street that extend to the southern portion of the City block through to Capitol Avenue. Visitors to Sutter's Fort would no longer be able to see the upper portion of the Old Tavern Building. The new SMF Building would be stepped back from L Street and immediate views from ground level would appear as a two-story building. Views from farther to the north, including from Sutter's Fort, would be of a four-story building with ground-level landscaping. The scale and mass of the proposed SMF Building would be consistent with the existing Buhler Building to the east, and the height would be approximately the same as the existing Pioneer Church to the west. (DEIR, p. 6.1-22.)

The view of the west side of the proposed SMF Building would include screening walls around the Energy Center equipment (liquid oxygen tank and transformer yard) and the entrance to the underground parking area. A 22-foot tall metal, louvered wall would be constructed along the west side of the SMF motor court along the north and east sides of the oxygen tanks, while a 10-foot tall concrete wall would be constructed around the transformer yard, adjacent to the existing playground area. The screening wall adjacent to the existing playground may be visible from Capitol Avenue. (DEIR, p. 6.1-22.)

Existing views of one- and two-story buildings from 28th Street and Capitol Avenue would be replaced with the east elevation of the SMF Building. Views north and south along 28th Street would also include the new pedestrian bridge from the SMF Building to the Buhler Building. The pedestrian bridge would be a glass enclosed structure that would connect the two buildings at the second floor. This view would also be consistent with the existing visual character of 28th Street, which includes the Buhler Building and SGH. (DEIR, p. 6.1-25.)

Ingress and egress into the SMF Building would be through a private drive located on the west side of the building, between the new SMF Building and Pioneer Church and senior housing. This driveway would also serve to set back the new building from Pioneer Church by approximately 30 feet. (DEIR, p. 6.1-25.)

Future Medical Office Building

The view of the existing St. Luke's Medical Office Building (MOB) would be replaced with the new Future MOB at the corner of Capitol Avenue and 26th Street that would be smaller in scale than the existing four-story building (see Figure 6.1-14). The existing 70,000-square foot building would be replaced with approximately 35,000 square feet of medical office space. Additional squarer footage for parking for the Future MOB would be below-grade and would not be visible. Ingress and egress to the parking garage would be either on the south side of the building, exiting onto the alley or along the west side exiting onto 26th Street. Future views of the MOB project site would be similar to views and would be in scale with the two-story residences to the west along 26th Street that would remain. Views onto the project site from Trinity Cathedral would also be similar to existing views of the St. Luke's building. (DEIR, p. 6.1-25.)

The Community Parking Structure would replace views of surface parking lots with a seven-story above-grade building up to 83-feet high (see Figure 6.1-15). The Community Parking Structure would replace current views looking north from N Street of the senior housing and the EAP building, Trinity Apartment, vacant lot, Capitol Physical Therapy, Café Bernardo's, and the Monkey Bar. The Community Parking Structure would be located on the south side of the alleyway between Capitol Avenue and N Street and would replace existing views from the alleyway that currently extend across the parking lot to the residences and offices on N Street. The parking structure would include one-story ground floor retail or commercial development on the south side, facing N Street. Ingress and egress into the parking structure would be from 27th and 28th Streets. The parking structure would be across the street from the RT maintenance facility on 28th Street and residential, office, and restaurant uses to the south on N Street. While the new parking structure would be generally consistent with other types of uses in the project area, it would replace existing surface-level uses with a seven-story structure. In addition to replacing the existing views from both the residences on the south side of N Street and the existing business on 28th Street north of the alleyway, the parking structure could result in additional shadows across the street and alleyway that may extend onto the residences, offices, and Capitol Physical Therapy during specific times of the day and year. (DEIR, p. 6.1-25.)

Theatre

The proposed Children's Theatre of California would be an approximately 50,000-square-foot building located on the corner of Capitol Avenue and 27th Street. The Theatre would replace existing views of the Trinity Apartment building, surface lots, and the EAP office building with one main 365-seat theatre and one additional theatre that would contain 200 seats. Similar to the SMCS components, design of the proposed Theatre would be required to comply with the Central City and Alhambra Corridor Design Guidelines. (DEIR, p. 6.1-28.)

The proposed SMCS Project is subject to the City's Design Guidelines and the design of the project includes many elements that are consistent with these guidelines. For example, the proposed WCC includes a multi-planed facade to minimize the overall scale of the building's mass, and the proposed SMF Building includes a stepped-back design from L Street to reduce visual impacts. Additionally, the proposed Community Parking Structure includes single-story retail uses that would front N Street. (DEIR, p. 6.1-28.)

Mitigation Measures: The Project will not result in significant aesthetic impacts because of the design of the Project and compliance with the design review guidelines. In addition, all components of the SMCS Project would be subject to a landscaping plan that would maintain and enhance existing streetscape by retaining existing trees, where feasible, and adding new trees, decorative paving, and new ornamental landscaping.

However, to assure that the potential impacts remain below a level of significance, the project proponent shall implement mitigation measure 6.1-1 which provides: *The north facade of the proposed Community Parking Structure, adjacent to the alleyway between 27th and 28th Streets, shall be designed to minimize visual impacts on the existing businesses along the alleyway, either through a building stepback or wall treatments, including vegetation and/or artwork.* (DEIR, pp. 6.1-30.)

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.1-28.)

Impact 6.1-2:
Implementation of the SMCS Project could create light or glare that could affect adjacent properties. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.1-30.)

Finding: This impact can be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.1-2(a). Changes or alterations therefore have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR, and result in a less-than-significant impact.

Explanation: The proposed SMCS and Children's Theatre projects would introduce new sources of lighting to the project area. Existing conditions include office buildings, residences, surface parking, and some street lights, all of which include existing sources of light. The SMCS Project would also introduce three new skyline-type illuminated signs that would be visible from locations west and east of SGH and the proposed WCC. Because the SMCS Project and the Children's Theatre would introduce several new sources of light and potential glare, this would be a *potentially significant impact.* (DEIR, pp. 6.1-32.)

Most of the components of the proposed SMCS Project would not create significant sources of glare on surrounding areas, however. The SMF Building would be stepped back on its northern side, and the remaining facades would be a combination of copper and horizontal siding and windows. The WCC facades would be a combination of transparent and patterned or etched glass windows and bands of off-white metal panels. The building's base would be sheathed in copper and would be visible from north and southbound traffic on the elevated Capital City Freeway. (DEIR, p. 6.1-30.)

Hospital Lights and Signage

As mentioned above, the proposed SMCS Project would include skyline signs, which consist of illuminated signs mounted at the parapet level of a building. Three skyline signs are proposed: one on the east side and one on the west side of the WCC and one on the east side of SGH. Skyline signs would be used as distance identification and way finding for the medical complex. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

Two of the proposed skyline signs would be visible from the Capital City Freeway. The eastern skyline sign is intended to be seen along the route at a distance to help drivers identify the general site location and upcoming exits from both north and southbound approaches. The signs would be sized for distance recognition, with the east facade WCC sign at 5-feet high individual letters with an overall width of 100 feet. The letters and logo form would be illuminated 24 hours a day. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

As described in the EIR, the SMCS Project would also include monument-style signs that would be located at ground level and would display directional information. These four-sided signs would be placed at each major decision-making corner throughout the complex and would be internally illuminated for night viewing. Monument-style sign massing would be approximately 10 feet in height and five feet wide per side and would include multi-lingual text. In addition, vehicular-directional style signage would include two two-sided vehicular directional signs placed at individual driveways into the WCC and SMF Building. These signs would be illuminated and would stand 10 feet in height and five feet wide. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

Building identification is proposed at first floor levels at main building entries to identify and reinforce destinations within the complex, such as "Buhler Building" or "EMERGENCY." These signs would be building-facade mounted individual letters that may be 12 inches to 24 inches in height, depending on the building name. These signs could be internally illuminated or lit with ambient lighting, with the exception of the Sutter General Emergency Room public entry, which must display red illuminated "EMERGENCY" signage at the entry doors. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

Ground-level illuminated signs, either on the surface of buildings or mounted in the parking and driving areas, would not generate substantial spillover light onto existing uses. The signage that would be most visible to surrounding uses would be the skyline illuminated signs located near the tops of the proposed WCC and SGH. The skyline signs on the east sides of the WCC and Sutter General Hospital would be visible from cars driving on the Capital City Freeway and from the parking area located under the freeway between 29th and 30th Streets. These signs could also be visible from existing uses east of the freeway. The skyline sign on the west side of the WCC would be visible from the west. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

The proposed WCC would include lighting on the top of the building associated with the proposed helistop. The helistop would be used for periodic infrequent transfers of seriously ill infants, children, and adults to the hospital. The helistop lighting would not be visible to the ground. However, floodlighting to illuminate the area for medical personnel may be visible. In addition, the helistop identification beacon would be visible from the ground, as would the red obstruction lights installed on various corners of the building. (DEIR, p. 6.1-31.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.1-2(a) would ensure that project lighting would be directed internally to minimize spillover onto adjacent uses. Mitigation Measure 6.1-2(b) would ensure that building facade materials do not generate substantial glare. Mitigation Measure 6.1-2 (c) would ensure that the illuminated skyline on the WCC is not visible to sensitive receptors located within or adjacent to Sutter's Fort.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.1-32.)

Impact 6.1-3: Implementation of the SMCS Project could create substantial shadows on adjacent properties. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.1-33.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Women's and Children's Center: The WCC would replace a surface valet parking lot, the Energy Center, the Old Tavern parking structure, and the (former) RAS medical office with an 8-story above-grade structure, approximately 167 feet high to the top of the mechanical penthouse. Construction of the WCC would create new shadows from a multi-story building and the shadows cast by this proposed element would extend farther than under current conditions. However, there are existing sources of shadow, including the parking structure next to the Old Tavern Building and the existing Energy Center. At times of the year when the sun is low in the sky, even shorter buildings cast shadows on sidewalks. For instance, in winter, the three-story parking structure will cast a shadow on the sidewalk on the south side of Capitol Avenue. Therefore, while the proposed WCC would create new shadow, most of the surrounding area already experiences frequent periods of shadow during the day from existing buildings in the midtown area. (DEIR, p. 6.1-33.) The impacts to existing surrounding commercial and retail uses, moreover, would be less than significant considering the types of uses involved. SMF Building: As stated above, ingress and egress into the SMF Building would be through a driveway located on the west side of the building, between the new SMF Building and Pioneer Church and the existing playground. This driveway would also serve to set back the new building from Pioneer Church. Because the SMF Building would be set back by approximately 30 feet from the Pioneer Church and the playground and because the height of the building is not expected to exceed the height of the Church, it is not anticipated that the building would block sunlight into the church windows or create substantial shadow impacts on the playground. (DEIR, p. 6.1-33.)

Community Parking Structure: In addition to replacing the existing views from both the residences on the south side of N Street and the existing business on 28th Street north of the alleyway, the Community Parking Structure could result in additional shadows across the street and alleyway that may extend onto the residences and Capitol Physical Therapy Center during specific times of the day and year. (DEIR, p. 6.1-33.)

Theatre: It is not expected that the Theatre would result in shadows that would significantly block sunlight on adjacent uses. (DEIR, p. 6.1-33.)

In addition to the specific elements discussed above, the rest of the SMCS Project components would generate new shadows in the project area. The proposed Future MOB would replace an existing building with a new building on a smaller scale and would cast similar shadows as under existing conditions. Similarly, the Sutter Midtown Housing Project will replace the St. Luke's parking structure with two- to three-story residential town homes, which would most likely produce shorter shadows. In addition, existing uses on and around the project components currently create shadows on City streets and office, residential, restaurant, and public uses. Therefore, this would be considered a ***less-than-significant impact***. (DEIR, pp. 6.1-34.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.1-34.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.1-34.)

Impact 6.1-4: Implementation of the SMCS Project could conflict with applicable City policies or design guidelines. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.1-34.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The proposed SMCS Project is subject to the Central City Neighborhood and Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines are intended to ensure the proper relationship and connection with surrounding development between neighborhoods in the Corridor, East Sacramento, and Midtown. (DEIR, p. 6.1-34.)

The Design Guidelines include generalized goals and policies for residential, mixed-use, commercial, and industrial neighborhoods. The Design Guidelines also include a landscape element and address the Neighborhood Preservation Transition Buffer Areas. The Buffer Area applies to any development in any zone that is located within 300 feet of a residential zone (measured from the street centerline) and includes a 35-foot height limit. Development of the Future MOB, Community Parking Structure, Sutter Midtown Housing Project and Theatre components would require a variance for buildings that are proposed over 35 feet high. (DEIR, pp. 6.1-34 – 6.1-35.)

The Central City project-design guidelines address the following design subjects that are relevant to the SMCS Project: site planning; site design; building character and quality; lighting; signage; equipment, utilities and service access; energy efficiency; modifications to existing structures; special use structures; alley development; accessory structures; and flood-resistant design. The City Design Review and Preservation Board has reviewed the SMCS Project components' design plans for consistency with the Central City Neighborhood Design Guidelines. Because the SMCS Project elements are anticipated to be in context with existing surrounding uses, and the project design is subject to approval by the City Design Review and Preservation Board, this is a ***less-than-significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.1-35.)

Theatre: It is assumed the Theatre would be designed to be consistent with City policies and adopted design guidelines and would be subject to review and approval based on its consistency, therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant.* (DEIR, p. 6.1-35.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.1-35.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.1-35.)

Impact 6.1-5: Implementation of the SMCS Project, in combination with cumulative development, could alter the visual character of the Central City. (Less than Significant) (DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: SMCS Project and Theatre:

Development of the various project components would result in the demolition of some existing buildings and the construction of new buildings. The Central City area, including the Corridor area, is predominantly built out with existing residential, commercial, office and municipal uses. Future projects in the area could include on-going redevelopment by the City of Sacramento, as well as private projects that may change the visual character of the area. Because the Central City area is predominately built out and future development would be required to comply with the Design Guidelines, the cumulative change to the visual character of the area would be a ***less-than-significant impact.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)**

Mitigation Measures: ***None required.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)**

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)

<u>Impact 6.1-6:</u> Implementation of the SMCS Project, in combination with cumulative development within the viewshed of the project site, could create light or glare that could affect adjacent properties. (Less than Significant) (DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:
As stated above, the Central City and Alhambra Corridor areas currently consist of built-out urban, commercial, and residential neighborhoods. The areas within the viewshed of the SMCS Project currently contain small to mid-sized office and residential buildings and associated lighting. The project area also contains existing City street lights, and lighting for commercial and public uses. Future redevelopment construction in the area would either construct new buildings on currently vacant lots and parking lots or replace existing buildings with new ones. It is not anticipated that future projects would contribute new sources of significant lighting or glare. In addition, future projects would be reviewed by the City's Design Review and Preservation Board for consistency with the City's design guidelines, including site lighting guidelines. The SMCS Project would introduce new sources of lighting to the project area, which currently contains existing sources of light from office buildings, residences, surface parking, and street lights. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.1-2 would ensure that the project-specific light impact would remain less-than significant. Therefore, the cumulative impact from light and glare would be ***less than significant.*** (DEIR, pp. 6.1-36-6.1-37.)

Mitigation Measures: ***None required.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.1-37.)**

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.1-36.)

2. AIR QUALITY

Impact 6.2-1: Increase in fugitive dust from demolition of existing buildings. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.2-14.)

Finding: This impact can be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.2-1. Changes or alterations have therefore been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: As part of the SMCS Project, a number of existing buildings would need to be demolished and these activities would generate fugitive dust. Significant amounts of fugitive dust (PM_{10}), even though they would be temporary in nature, could have health impacts on sensitive receptors. (DEIR, p. 6.2-15.)

There were ten buildings slated for demolition as part of the SMCS Project, totaling over 114,000 square feet (sf). It can be assumed that the largest fugitive dust impact from building demolition would occur when the largest building is demolished. The medical office was and would be rebuilt with a smaller structure as part of the SMCS Project. Construction of the WCC would require demolition of the Old Tavern parking structure, the (former) RAS medical office, and the Energy Center, as well as a surface parking lot. Construction of the Community Parking Structure would not require any building demolition., (DEIR, p. 6.2-15.)

Using the URBEMIS 2002 modeling program, it was determined that fugitive dust associated with demolition of the St. Luke's Medical Office Building was calculated to be the largest area that would be demolished. A total of approximately 403.84 pounds per day of PM_{10} was calculated to occur during building demolition. The SMAQMD's standard of significance for PM_{10} is a concentration-based threshold of 50 $\mu g/m^3$. The SMAQMD does not provide any guidance for calculating PM_{10} concentrations from demolition activities with a dispersion model. However, it can be assumed that the 403.84 pounds per day of dust from building demolition would exceed the SMAQMD's PM_{10} concentration threshold at the property line during the most intensive demolition period. Consequently, this would be considered a ***short-term significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-15.) The 2005b URBEMIS modeling conducted as part of the Revised EIR supplements this information.

Theatre: The Children's Theatre of California project would be developed on land that is partially occupied by two existing buildings (EAP Building and Trinity Apartments). The Trinity Apartments are proposed to be demolished at the start of the SMCS Project. The EAP building would be demolished at the end of the SMCS Project. At this time, the Theatre has not yet submitted a formal application to the City for consideration of the Children's Theatre project. At the time an application is submitted to the City it is anticipated additional environmental review would be required. However, at this time, as

with the SMCS Project, demolition of these structures would generate fugitive dust that could cause the SMAQMD'S PM_{10} concentration standard to be exceeded. This would be considered a ***short-term significant impact.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.2-15.)**

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.2-1 and 6.2-2 would substantially reduce the amount of PM_{10} generated by building demolition. Mitigation Measure 6.2-1 provides:

6.2-1 (a) *The project applicant shall require in all construction contracts that the demolition contractors will ensure that all exterior surfaces of buildings are wetted during building demolition activities. The material from any building demolition shall be completely wetted during any period when the material is being disturbed, such as during the removal from the construction site.*

(b) All piles of demolished material shall be wetted and covered until removed from the site.

(c) Maintain two feet of freeboard space on haul trucks.

(d) All operations shall expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded by sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant).

(e) Wheel washers for exiting trucks shall be installed, or all trucks and equipment leaving the site shall be washed off.

(f) *All trucks removing demolition debris or excavated soil from the site(s) shall be wetted and covered.*

(g) *SMCS or contractor shall ensure that buildings are demolished in succession, and that no buildings are demolished simultaneously.*

(DEIR, p. 6.2-16.)

In general, keeping buildings wetted-down (Mitigation Measure 6.2-1(a)) is a technique employed on a regular basis by demolition contractors. Although the SMAQMD does not have regulations for demolition that specify mitigation for this activity, other districts have regulations of this nature. (see San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Regulation VIII – Control Measures for Construction Emission of PM_{10}). This regulation specifies measures that can be used to limit PM_{10} during construction activities. (DEIR, p. 6.2-16.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-16.)

Impact 6.2-2: Fugitive dust during grading of construction site(s). (Less than Significant After Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.2-17.)

Finding: This impact can be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.2-2. Changes or alterations have therefore been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the short-term significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: Prior to actual building construction, the building sites must be graded and prepared for development. Fugitive dust or PM_{10} is generated during this process as the ground is disturbed. The total amount of PM_{10} generated is normally determined by the size of the graded area. The larger the area, the more PM_{10} is created. In the case of the SMCS Project, the total area to be graded is approximately 6 acres. This estimate also includes grading for the future Children's Theatre of California. It is anticipated that grading would not occur on one large parcel of land, but on five separate parcels. Because of the staggered construction schedule, it is unlikely that these parcels would be graded simultaneously. Since the parcels are relatively small, it is assumed that each parcel would be completely graded during the course of a single day. The most fugitive dust would be generated during the grading of the largest parcel. The largest individual parcel is the approximately 1.7 acre Community Parking Structure site. (DEIR, p. 6.2-17.)

The SMAQMD recommends a PM_{10} threshold of significance that is equal to the CAAQS for PM_{10} of 50 $\mu g/m^3$. The SMAQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County* (Guide) specifies a methodology for evaluating whether a project would exceed this PM_{10} standard during construction. Appendix B of the Guide contains Table B.1 – Particulate Matter Screening Level for Construction Projects. This table lists various acreages and mitigation associated with the various acreage ranges which would reduce PM_{10} impacts to less-than-significant levels. As long as a project's maximum acreage graded per day falls into one of the acreage ranges, and the appropriate mitigation measures are applied, the project would be considered to have a less than significant PM_{10} impact during construction, and no concentration modeling is required. (DEIR, p. 6.2-17.)

Theatre: Grading associated with the Children's Theatre component is included in the total 6 project acres because it is assumed this site would be graded during construction of the SMCS Project. Therefore, the impact would be considered a ***short-term significant impact.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.2-17.)**

Mitigation Measures: As noted above, the SMAQMD requires specific mitigation for projects of different sizes to ensure that PM_{10} thresholds are not exceeded. According to Table B.1 of the SMAQMD Guide, the SMCS Project would have to implement Level One mitigation to ensure that PM_{10} levels do not exceed the SMAQMD threshold. Level One mitigation includes such things as watering exposed soil and ensuring that there is freeboard space on haul trucks that transport dirt and other material. For projects between 5.1 and 8 acres, the SMAQMD requires the following mitigation. According to the SMAQMD Guide, compliance with Mitigation Measure 6.2-2 would decrease fugitive dust

(PM_{10}) impacts from grading associated with the SMCS Project and the Theatre to a level that is considered *less than significant.* (DEIR, p. 6.2-18.) Mitigation Measure 6.2-2 requires:

6.2-2 The following measures are required by the SMAQMD for level one mitigation, and shall be implemented during grading at all project sites:

(a) *Water exposed soil twice daily, or more frequently as necessary to control dust.*

(b) *Maintain two feet of freeboard space on haul trucks*

In addition, the following measures shall be implemented to further reduce the PM_{10} *impact during construction activity:*

(c) *All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.)*

(d) *Wheel washers for all exiting trucks shall be installed, or all trucks and equipment leaving the site shall be washed off.*

(e) *Excavation and grading activity shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 mph.*

(f) *All trucks removing demolition debris or excavated soil from the site(s) shall be wetted and covered.*

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-18.)

Impact 6.2-3: Increase in NO_X emissions generated by construction equipment. (Significant and Unavoidable for SMCS Project; Less than Significant for Theatre). (DEIR, p. 6.2-18; RDEIR, pp. 6.2-2R through 6.2-8R.)

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the SMCS Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the Project' s short-term significant effects associated with air quality. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain short-term significant and unavoidable.

For the Theatre, however, no mitigation measures are required. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Various pieces of construction equipment would be used during the demolition, grading and construction of the SMCS Project components. Much of this equipment is diesel-fueled and emits NO_X as part of the fuel-combustion process. The "worst case" scenario for NOx emissions from project construction activities would occur in spring 2007 when there would be an overlap in construction activity on four of the Project buildings (e.g., the Women's and Children's Center, Sutter Medical Foundation Building (SMF), Future MOB and residential components. Construction of the Community Parking Structure would be completed by this time. (RDEIR, p. 6.2-2R.) A majority of the building demolition activities have been completed with the exception of the Old Tavern parking structure and the central plant, which is anticipated to occur in early 2007 and to be completed by 2008. (RDEIR, p. 6.2-2R.)_As discussed in Impact 6.2-1 and Impact 6.2-2 [see July 2005 Draft EIR], the project sites for the various SMCS Project components would not be graded simultaneously. However, actual construction of the buildings would overlap. Consequently, for purposes of calculating reasonable worst case daily emissions of NO_X, the site(s) with the most pieces of equipment being used at any one time would have the highest daily NO_X amounts, were used to conduct the NO_X modeling. According to the construction schedule, there would be periods where a number of different project components would have overlapping construction activities in 2007. As mentioned above, these would be the WCC (398,400 square feet), the SMF Building (203,382), and the Future MOB (35,000 square feet). (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, p. 6.2-2R through 6.2-4R.)

Construction of the WCC is scheduled to begin in early spring 2007 and be completed by late 2010. Construction of the SMF Building was scheduled to begin in the fall of 2006 and be completed by the spring of 2008. The Future MOB was initially anticipated to begin construction in early summer 2006 and be completed by late summer 2007; however, this schedule has been delayed. Construction of the Future MOB is not anticipated to begin until early 2007, and may start later. The residential units will continue to be constructed throughout 2006-2007. These project components could have construction periods that overlap by four to six months, from the spring of 2007 to the middle or end of summer 2007. This period would be when the most construction equipment would be operating simultaneously, and consequently, when the greatest daily amounts of criteria air pollutants would be generated by construction activities. For this reason, the URBEMIS model was used to estimate NO_X emissions during this peak period of construction activity. The URBEMIS model results therefore represent a "worst case" scenario. NO_X emissions during other construction periods would be less than peak emissions, because fewer NO_X-emitting construction activities would be underway. (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, p. 6.2-4R.)

The URBEMIS 2002 Version 7.5 was used to calculate NO_X emissions from the construction phases, including building demolition and grading, of these buildings during this overlapping period1. An inventory of the reasonably anticipated number and type of construction equipment that could be used for the proposed project, however, is included in the technical memorandum in the RDEIR._(DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, pp. 6.2-4R to 6.2-5R.)

Project specific equipment provided by Turner Construction was used with the URBEMIS

1 Version 7.5 of the URBEMIS 2002 model was used because version 8.7 released in 2005 only updated the operational motor vehicle emission factors and did not change the construction emissions module. Therefore, version 7.5 was used to be consistent with what was originally modeled for the project.

2002 Version 7.5 modeling. In some instances, the exact type of equipment listed by Turner Construction did not appear in the URBEMIS model's internal equipment list. In those instances, the equipment listed by Turner was matched up with the most similar equipment (in type and horsepower) provided by URBEMIS. The new modeling showed that construction associated with the WCC would generate approximately 45.89 pounds per day of NO_X in spring 2007, construction associated with the SMF Building would generate 143.93 pounds per day of NO_X during this same period, the Future MOB would contribute 68.82 pounds per day, and construction of the residential units would contribute 34.35 pounds per day. These emissions would combine as shown in Table 2 in the RDEIR: (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, pp. 6.2-5R to 6.2-6R.)

As Table 2 of the RDEIR indicates, the total maximum NO_X emissions from construction activities would be approximately 292.99 pounds of NO_X per day during the portion of 2007 where construction overlaps. These estimates of NO_X emissions due to Project construction differ from the estimates provided in the October 2005 Final EIR because the modeling is based on a refinement to the number and type of construction equipment to be used. This would be in excess of the SMAQMD construction NO_X threshold of 85 pounds per day and would be a ***short-term significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, p. 6.2-6R.)

Theatre: The Children's Theatre of California proposes to build a 565-seat theatre that would include an approximately 50,000-square-foot building to house the B Street Theatre and the Children's Theatre of California. As discussed in chapter 2, Project Description, the Children's Theatre would be developed by an entity other than SMCS, and would be subject to additional environmental review during the processing of development entitlements. As with the SMCS Project, Table 3.1 of the SMAQMD guide was used to determine the type and amount of equipment that would be used during the construction period. Using these assumptions, NO_X emissions were calculated for a building this size when built over a one year period. Maximum daily NO_X construction emissions were estimated to be approximately 60.87 pounds per day. This would not exceed the SMAQMD standards of significance for construction NO_X and would result in a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, pp. 6.2-6r to 6.2-7R.)

Mitigation Measures: The SMAQMD requires that certain standard mitigation measures be implemented for all construction projects. The SMAQMD requires that Mitigation Measure 6.2-3 (a-c) below be implemented for all construction projects. Mitigation Measure 6.2-3 (a) requires a reduction of 20% of NO_X emissions. In addition, Mitigation Measure 6.2-3 (d-h) as modified by the Planning Commission and as set forth in Errata #2 to the Final EIR, would further decrease the emissions of NO_X from construction activities mostly from using alternative fueled equipment, which could reduce NO_X emissions by another 14%. Implementation of both of these measures could result in a 34% reduction in NO_X emissions during construction, at most. With this 34% reduction peak NO_X emissions during construction would total approximately 193 pounds per day. Further, SMCS has tendered a contribution to the SMAQMD Construction Mitigation Fund in an amount satisfactory to the District.

Although these measures would reduce construction-related NO_X emission, peak NO_X emissions would remain above the level of significance of 85 pounds per day. This impact would therefore remain a short-term significant and unavoidable impact. NO_X reduction from heavy-duty equipment is limited by available technology. Mitigation in addition to that listed below, and that would substantially reduce NO_X emissions beyond this level, is not available at this time. (DEIR, pp. 6.2-20-21; RDEIR, p. 6.2-7R; FREIR, p.4-5 (as revised).)

6.2-3 The following measures recommended by the SMAQMD shall be incorporated into construction practices:

(a) The project applicant shall require the project developer or contractor to provide a plan for approval by SMAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_X reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction;

(b) The project applicant shall require the project developer or contractor to submit to SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.

(c) The project applicant shall require the project developer or contractor to ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey.

In addition to the above, the following NO_X reducing measures shall be incorporated in all construction contracts:

(d) Construction equipment shall be kept in optimum running condition at all times.

(e) If required, use alternative-fueled (such as aqueous fuel) and/or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment.

(f) If any diesel-fueled generators are used during construction, one shall be replaced with a propane fueled gen-set. The project applicant or contractor shall coordinate with SMAQMD to ensure this is implemented.

(g) Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment.

(h) New technologies to control ozone precursor emissions shall be utilized as they become available and are required by the SMAQMD.

(i) During the peak construction period, the amount of construction equipment in use on the project site at any one time shall be limited to the following pieces, or equipment that would produce equivalent emissions:

- Four concrete pumps;
- One tract/tower crane;
- Seven small hydraulic cranes;
- Thirteen welding machines;
- Four boom lifts;
- Six forklifts.

The construction site manager shall ensure the construction equipment is consistent with what is listed above, or that any equipment substitutions does not exceed equivalent emissions.

(j) The project applicant shall require that the construction contractor retain a construction site manager. The construction site manager shall verify that all truck idling is limited to two minutes for delivery trucks, dump trucks, and other construction equipment. The construction site manager shall also verify that engines are properly maintained.

(DEIR, pp. 6.2-20 to 6.2-21; RDEIR, pp. 6.2-7R to 6.2-8R; RFEIR, p. 4-5.)

Significance After Mitigation: For the SMCS Project, the impact remains significant and unavoidable despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. (DEIR, p. 6.2-20; RDEIR, p. 6.2-6R.) For the Theatre, the impact is less than significant without

mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-19; RDEIR, p. 6.2-7R.)

Impact 6.2-4: Generation of ROG and NO_X (criteria pollutants) associated with project operation. (Significant and Unavoidable for the SMCS Project; less than significant for the Theatre). (DEIR, p. 6.2-21.)

Finding: For the SMCS Project, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the Project's significant effects associated with air quality. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce or render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

For the Theatre, no mitigation measures are required for impacts because the impact is

less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Operation of the SMCS Project would generate an increase in criteria pollutants associated with hospital operation. ROG and NO_X are the primary criteria pollutants of concern in Sacramento County because they react to form ozone, which is considered a criteria pollutant. The County is currently in nonattainment of the federal and State ozone standards. Emissions would be created by the SMCS Project in two ways; 1) Stationary equipment used to operate the facilities (industrial boilers, water heaters), would create ozone precursors of ROG and NO_X, and 2) the increase in traffic generated by the project would also contribute ROG and NO_X.

The project component that is expected to contain most of the large fuel-fired equipment would be the proposed Energy Center. Equipment at the new Energy Center would, for the most part, replace older equipment at the existing Energy Center. The horsepower or capacity of some of the equipment may be increased to account for the larger size of the expanded SMCS facilities. Equipment would include natural gas boilers for heat, electric chillers, and diesel-fueled backup generators. Five evaporative cooling towers would also be included. All new equipment would require a permit from the SMAQMD prior to operation. This would ensure that the equipment achieves the lowest achievable emission rate for its equipment class. Consequently, the newer equipment may actually be held to more stringent emission standards than existing equipment. (DEIR, p. 6.2-21.)

The amount of ROG and NO_X that would be generated by operation of the project was calculated using the URBEMIS 2002 modeling program. (DEIR, p. 6.2-22.) As shown in Table 6.2-5 of the DEIR, the combined impact from operation of all the SMCS buildings would exceed the SMAQMD thresholds of 65 lbs/day for ROG and NO_X. This would result in a ***significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-22.)

Theatre: Because of it's smaller size, the Theatre will generate fewer operational and construction emissions. In addition, because the Theatre would function as a rehearsal and performance space, its use is less intensive than any of the SMCS components, where numerous activities occur on a more or less continuous basis. Stationary source emissions from the Theatre would be limited to those generated by heating and cooling units. The

majority of emissions from the project would be generated by the traffic that would travel to and from the theatre for performances. The intermittent nature of the traffic generated by the theatre is reflected in the traffic study prepared for the project, and is consequently reflected in the URBEMIS modeling. The modeling showed that, on average, the theatre would generate 15.62 pounds per day of ROG and 2.04 pounds per day of NO_X, as shown in Table 6.2-5. This would be less than the SMAQMD thresholds of significance, and would consequently be a *less-than-significant impact.* (DEIR, pp. 6.2-2 to 6.2-22.)

Mitigation Measures: The SMAQMD recommends that lead agencies require projects to reduce their ozone precursor emissions by 15%. The SMAQMD Guide provides a list of measures that can be used to achieve this 15% reduction. Each measure has an associated percentage point value. The SMCS Project has many of the listed measures

built into its project design, and by virtue of the fact that it is located in downtown Sacramento where there is easy access to public transit. The Project Design includes the following:

- Project site is located within ½ mile of an existing Class I or Class II bike lane and provides a comparable bikeway connection to that existing facility. (1 point)
- Bus service provides headways of 15 minutes or less for stops within ¼ mile. (1 point)
- High density residential, mixed, or retail/commercial uses within ¼ mile of existing transit, linking with activity centers and other planned infrastructure. (1 point for bus only)
- Office floor area ratio is 0.75 or greater within ¼ mile of an existing transit stop. (1.5 points for bus only)
- Have at least three of the following on site and/or within ¼ mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Personal Services, Open space, Office. (1 point) Some shaded parking. (0.5points)

In addition to the six points listed above, as described in the Project Description in Chapter 2 of this DEIR, the following measures are components of the SMCS TSM Plan for the SMCS project. These measures have also been assigned points by the SMAQMD:

- Preferential parking for carpools and vanpools. (0.5 points)
- Provide Guaranteed Ride Home. (0.2 points)
- Provide on-site transportation coordinator. (0.2 points)
- Flextime. (0.2 points)
- Provide showers and clothes lockers. (0.5 points)

- Class I and Class II bicycle parking facilities. (0.5 points)

The SMCS shall also institute the following measures as part of the TSM plan once the project is built. These measures are also found in Chapter 2, Project Description and have been assigned point values by the SMAQMD as well:

- A Kiosk shall be provided displaying transportation information in a prominent area. (0.5 points)

- 75% monthly transit or vanpool subsidy (up to $100). (1.0 points)

(DEIR, p. 6.2-23.)

Compliance with Mitigation Measure 6.2-4 (a-e) as modified in the first Errata to the Final EIR would provide the additional ozone precursor reductions needed to achieve the 15% recommended by the SMAQMD. However, this reduction would not reduce operational impacts to less than significant levels, in part, because most emissions associated with the project are the result of vehicle trips. This impact would remain a *significant and unavoidable impact.* (DEIR, p. 6.2-22 to -24.)

Significance After Mitigation: The SMCS Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.2-22.)

The Theatre project would result in less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-22.)

Impact 6.2-5: Increase in CO concentrations from project-related traffic. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.2-24.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As shown in Table 6.2-7 of the DEIR, although CO concentrations would increase at some intersections as a result of the SMCS Project when compared to No Project conditions, the modeling showed that 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations would not exceed the CAAQS. Since the federal standard for CO is 15 ppm higher than the CAAQS, concentrations would also be below the federal standard. This would consequently be considered a ***less-than-significant impact.*** (DEIR, pp. 6.2-24.)

Mitigation Measures: None required. (DEIR, p. 6.2-25.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-24.)

Impact 6.2-6: Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.2-26.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project could generate TACs associated with both project construction and operation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-26.) Grading, and building construction would involve the use of diesel-fueled construction equipment. As this equipment burns diesel fuel, it will produce diesel particulate matter, which has been classified by the CARB as a TAC. The CARB determined that the chronic impact of diesel particulate was of more concern than the acute impact in its *Risk Management Guidance for the Permitting of New Stationary Diesel-Fueled Engines* (CARB, 2000). In this document, the CARB noted that "Our analysis shows that the potential cancer risk from inhalation is the critical path when comparing cancer and noncancer risk. In other words, a cancer risk of 10 per million from the inhalation of diesel PM will result from diesel PM concentrations that are much less than the diesel PM or TAC concentrations that would result in chronic or acute noncancer hazard index values of 1 or greater." Consequently, any analysis of diesel TAC should focus on the long-term, chronic cancer risk posed by the diesel exhaust. As mentioned above, chronic cancer risk is normally measured by assessing what the risk to an exposed individual from a source of TAC would be if the exposure occurred over 70 years. (DEIR, p. 6.2-26.)

Since the construction activity associated with the SMCS Project would occur over the course of approximately four years, receptors in the vicinity of the SMCS Project area would be exposed to diesel emissions intermittently. These receptors would not be subject to continuous TAC exposure during construction, and the duration of the construction period would be far less than the 70-year time-frame normally used to assess chronic TAC impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.2-26.)

Operation: Sources of TACs associated with project operation include boilers as part of daily operations. TACs are regulated through the local air districts by the Air Resource Board as a result of the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" information and Assessment Act (AB 2588). Under AB 2588, once the new SMCS buildings and facilities are operational, SMCS would be required to report any new emissions sources to the SMAQMD. The SMAQMD would then make a determination as to whether a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) would be required as a result of the expansion. If a HRA is required, the SMAQMD would use the assessment to determine the significance of the SMCS for TACs. (DEIR, pp. 6.2-26 - 6.2-27.)

The SMCS has not been required to perform a HRA since the 1980's, when the facility operated a special sterilizer that produced TACs. Sutter has since removed the sterilizer and is no longer required to perform HRA's. If future expansion triggers the preparation of a HRA, however, and the HRA shows that there is a significant TAC impact, AB 2588 requires that the impact be reduced by the facility to a level that is less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.2-27.)

It is not expected that the construction of these new uses would create significant new TAC sources. The SMCS Project is adding hospital space, building a new Energy Center, and adding a medical office building, additional parking and commercial/retail space. No new equipment would be included that could produce significant amounts of TAC. The equipment included in the newly expanded Energy Center would for the most part replace existing equipment, with possible increases to the horsepower of certain equipment. Almost all of the equipment would run on fuels other than diesel. Diesel-fueled backup generators would be included, for emergency situations. Use of these generators would only be allowed during emergency situations and for limited times during the year for testing purposes. Aside from new equipment, no new processes or activities would occur that could produce significant TAC. Consequently, the future uses would not be expected

from current uses in the amount of TAC's produced. Even if new TAC sources did develop in the future, the required HRA would determine the TAC effect, and the TAC source would be required to reduce the impact. (DEIR, p. 6.2-27.)

Since the impact from construction equipment would be temporary and minimal, and since stationary TAC sources are expected to be minimal as well, the project's TAC impact would be considered ***less than significant***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-27.)

Theatre: It is not expected that the theatre would have any TAC generating equipment. Consequently, the theatre is not expected to create any TACs; therefore, this would be considered a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.2-27.)

Mitigation Measures: None required. *(DEIR, p. 6.2-27.)*

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-26.)

Impact 6.2-7: The SMCS Project, in combination with other projects proposed within the SVAB, could result in a significant temporary cumulative air quality impacts from construction activities. (Less than Significant with Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.2-28.)

Finding: This impact can be minimized through Mitigation Measures 6.2-5 and 6.2-6. (DEIR, p. 6.2-28.) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation:

The SMCS Project would temporarily generate emissions for the duration of the construction activity. These construction-related emissions of pollutants would combine with other emission sources in the vicinity of the SMCS Project area. Criteria pollutants normally associated with construction are particulate matter and NO_X. ROG, an ozone precursor, is not normally generated in large in large amounts by heavy-duty construction equipment. Diesel particulate matter is also generated by construction equipment's diesel fuel combustion and is a TAC issue. (DEIR, p. 6.2-28.)

The area surrounding the project area is a high-density urban area. As such, there are few existing sources of particulates. However, data from the closest SMAQMD monitoring station shows that the State standard for PM_{10} was exceeded eight times in the last three years, so PM_{10} concentrations could be an issue in the vicinity of the SMCS Project area. As discussed in Impact 6.2-2, because of the relatively small size of the graded area, fugitive dust generated by construction could be reduced to levels that are less than significant. Any remaining dust would be in amounts small enough that the effect would not be cumulatively considerable. (DEIR, p. 6.2-28.)

While PM_{10} is a criteria pollutant that has impacts in the area where it is generated, NO_X is an ozone precursor that can add to ozone impacts regionally. Since ozone is a regional problem in the Sacramento area and the SVAB is in an ozone nonattainment area, any NO_X that is generated by project-related construction activity could conceivably contribute to one or more violations of the ozone standard. While the project's construction NO_X impact may appear to be small when viewed in context with all other NO_X sources in the region, its impact would be considered cumulatively considerable. Most large stationary sources of NO_X in the County have been regulated and have limited their emissions, and mobile sources make up an increasing percentage of the NO_X inventory. With this in mind, the NO_X problem is not caused primarily by large sources, but a combination of many smaller sources. Consequently, for the duration of the SCMS construction period, NO_X emissions from heavy-duty equipment would be generated in amounts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project would be considered to be contributing to a significant cumulative impact. (DEIR, pp. 6.2-28 - 6.2-29.)

As discussed in Impact 6.2-6, construction activity would also produce TAC emissions. These emissions would be temporary, and there are no other substantial sources of TACs in the project vicinity that could combine with construction TACs to produce any significant impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.2-29.)

Because of the SMCS' cumulatively considerable construction NO_X impact, the SMCS Project's construction would cause a ***short-term, cumulatively significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-29.)

Theatre

As with the SMCS Project, construction emissions of NO_X from the Children's Theatre project would combine with other emission sources and could contribute in the short-term to an ozone impact. The impact would be cumulatively considerable because the NO_X inventory for Sacramento County is not dominated by large sources, but by many individual small sources. Consequently, this would be a ***short-term, cumulatively significant impact***. (DEIR, pp. 6.2-29.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.2-5 and 6.2-6 would reduce the cumulative effect of NO_X generated during construction of the SMCS and the Theatre project to a *less-than-significant level*. This is because prohibiting construction on high AQI days would keep project construction activities from contributing to any

exceedance. (DEIR, pp. 6.2-20 -21; 6.2-28 thru -29.)

Also, mitigation measures applied in Impact 6.2-3 would help reduce cumulative NO_X from construction activities.

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-28.)

Impact 6.2-8: The SMCS Project, in combination with other projects in the SVAB could result in a cumulative impact on criteria pollutants associated with project operation. (Significant and Unavoidable for SMCS Project; Less than Significant for the Theatre). (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.)

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the SMCS Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the Project's significant effects associated with air quality criteria pollutants. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

For the Theatre, the impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:
As discussed in Impact 6.2-4, operations of the SMCS Project would be significant according to the SMAQMD's published thresholds for project impacts. The SMAQMD's 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance guidance states that development would be cumulatively significant if the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., general plan amendment, rezone), and the new land use is more intensive than the existing use.

The SMCS Projects would require a change to existing general plan designations and a zoning change. Approximately 1.5 blocks currently designated in the General Plan as "High-Density Residential" would be changed to a "Community/Neighborhood Commercial and Offices" designation. Six parcels currently zoned as "Office", and three parcels currently zoned "Multi-Family Residential" would be rezoned to "General Commercial". In both cases, the new land use would be more intensive than the existing land use, in that more vehicle-trips would be generated. Because this new activity would not be accounted for in the Sacramento Regional Ozone Attainment Plan, the impact from project operations would have a ***significant cumulative impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.)

Theatre:
As discussed above, the SMAQMD considers a project's operational emissions to be cumulatively considerable if the project would require a change in land use designation, and the proposed use is more intensive than the existing land use. Since the Children's

Theatre would require no such change, the impact is less than significant and would be a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.)

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measures implemented in Impact 6.2-4 and 6.2-7 would also reduce the proposed project's cumulative impacts. However, the impact would remain *cumulatively significant and unavoidable.* (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.)

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.) The Theatre project would result in less than significant cumulative impacts without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-30.)

Impact 6.2-9: Cumulative impact of CO concentrations from project-related traffic. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.2-31.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The traffic study prepared for the proposed project predicts future (2025) traffic volumes at nearby intersections for both project and no-project scenarios. This evaluation also takes into account traffic from other sources that would be in existence at this future date. Maximum CO concentrations were determined by conducting modeling at the intersections that would have LOS of "D" or below in 2025. Tables 6.2-8 and 6.2-9 of the Draft EIR show the LOS and expected maximum one-hour and eight-hour CO concentrations for these intersection in 2025 under both project and no-project scenarios. Consequently, CO concentrations in 2025 under "smart plan" conditions for both project and no-project scenarios were modeled as well. The results of this modeling are shown in Tables 6.2-10 and 6.2-11. As shown on Tables 6.2-8 and 6.2-9, even though LOS may be degraded in the future, CO levels under any scenario would not exceed the CAAQS for CO. This would be a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-31.)

Theatre

The 2025 traffic volumes predicted in the traffic study include trips generated by the Children' s Theatre of California. As discussed above, modeled CO levels at the most congested intersections would not be in excess of the CAAQS. Consequently, theatre-related traffic would not contribute to CO concentrations that would violate SMAQMD thresholds of significance. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.2-31.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.2-31.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-31.)

Impact 6.2-10: Cumulative impact of project-generated TACs. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.2-34.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As discussed in "Existing Emissions Sources and Concentrations", the SMCS Project area is located in an area that the CARB has identified as having a background cancer risk of between 750 and 1000 in one million. These background levels are already in excess of the TAC significance standard of 10 in one million. The high TAC level is mainly due to heavy-duty diesel trucks. The Sutter facilities would be subject to the requirements of AB 2588 that mandates that facilities report their emissions and reduce their TACs to levels that are less than significant. Consequently, the SMCS contribution to overall TAC levels would not be cumulatively significant because it would generate very small amounts of TAC, and other sources play a much larger role in creating the high cancer risk in Sacramento County. The SMCS would have a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.2-34.)

Theatre

The Children's Theatre of California is not expected to produce any TACs. In any case, the Theatre would be subject to AB 2588 that requires facilities to reduce their TAC emissions to less than significant levels. The background TAC level is already high, and is mostly caused by diesel truck traffic. Consequently, the Theatre would have little to no impact, and would not be cumulatively considerable when viewed with other TAC producing sources. This would be a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.2-34.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.2-34.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.2-34.)

ADDITIONAL AIR QUALITY MITIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

Finding:

Additional mitigation measures pertaining to air quality and suggested by commentors have not been adopted either because (1) the measures are already incorporated in the project description or included as mitiagation measures; (2) they are not necessary to address significant impacts; or (3) they are infeasible, as set forth in the FEIR, including the Revised EIR, or in written and oral responses provided by staff. (See AR 17:6282-6293; 4:1289, 1457-1458.)

First, with respect to NOx emissions of the project, a discussion of proposed mitigation measures to reduce NOx is included in Responses to Comments 2-36, 2-37, and 2-38 (Revised Final EIR, p. 4-3; see also AR 11:4202; 7:2634-2637, 2671-2672; 9:3588.). All feasible mitigation measures were also adopted for ROG and NOx during certification of the Final EIR. (AR 11:4201-4206; 17:6127-6129.)

Second, the City finds the suggested use of PuriNOx fuel infeasible because PuriNOx is no longer manufactured in North America since finding to interfere with construction equipment engines. (See Revised Final EIR, p. 4-6 (Response to Comment 1-9); see also PuriNOX Business Update (October 2006).) Therefore, the air district and the ARB no longer recommend use of this fuel.

Third, the City finds that the applicant is not required to contribute additional funds toward the SMAQMD off-site construction mitigation fee program for the reasons explained in Response to Comment 2-34. (See Revised Final EIR, p. 4-20.) At the time the 2005 Draft EIR for the SMCS project was released, the SMAQMD recommended mitigation fees as a mechanism to reduce air quality impacts to less than significant levels for projects approved based on a mitigated negative declaration. The SMAQMD later expanded application of the fee mechanism to apply to projects approved based on an EIR. According to a guidance letter to local lead agencies issued by the District on July 8, 2005, the expanded mitigation fee program applies to all environmental documents published on or after October 10, 2005. (See Revised Final EIR, Appendix D.) Because the Draft EIR for the SMCS project was published prior to October 10, 2005, the applicant was not, and is not, required to pay the fee to further mitigate the impacts of the project. ." (See also Revised Final EIR, Appendix C (Brief Of Amicus Curiae In Support Of Respondents And Real Parties In Interest).)

Furthermore, the Revised Draft EIR did not include payment of the fee because the conclusion of the 2005 Draft EIR air quality analysis -- that NO_x emissions would result in a short-term significant impact -- has not changed. The analysis in the Revised EIR indicates that construction-related NOx emissions will be similar, albeit slightly less than, the amount disclosed in the original 2005 EIR. (See also AR 23:8789.)

3. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 6.3-1: Construction of the SMCS and Theatre projects could adversely affect known and/or previously unidentified prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.3-16.)

Finding: This impact can be minimized through Mitigation Measure 6.3-1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation:

The proposed SMCS Project is in close proximity to known archeological resources that could be adversely affected by construction of the project. Previously undiscovered archeological subsurface material could also be present within the SMCS Project area due the previously described sensitivity of the area. Proposed construction for the SMCS Project includes several subsurface components; some areas could be excavated as much as 35 feet below the surface. Subsurface construction activities such as excavation,

drilling for new building pilings, etc. have the potential to impact unknown buried cultural resources. The use of necessary equipment to conduct such activities could damage or destroy these subsurface resources. An Unanticipated Discovery Plan is required in consultation with the Native American groups to establish procedures for the treatment of Native American burials and associated grave goods. This plan ensures coordination between the City, SMCS, the archaeological consultant, and the Most Likely Descendant, if human remains are discovered. The plan must be completed prior to the start of any construction activities. (DEIR, pp. 6.3-16 – 6.3-17.)

The SMCS Project area is also considered sensitive for subsurface prehistoric deposits; historical resources sensitivity is even greater. Due to the extensive historical use of the area and the fact that original Sutter's Fort structures were located outside of the present day park and block boundaries, there is also a strong potential for encountering historic subsurface features (e.g., privy pits, refuse dumps, and architectural foundations) associated with the earliest pre-Gold Rush and Gold Rush-era settlers, as well as material remains of later era residents. Due to the potential for the presence of sub-surface artifacts, this would be considered a ***potentially significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.3-17.)

Theatre

The site of the proposed Theatre project, as is also true of the SMCS project, is in close proximity to known archeological resources that could be adversely affected by implementation of the project and is in an area of high archaeological sensitivity. Previously undiscovered archeological subsurface material could also be present within the Theatre site. (DEIR, p. 6.3-17.) The overall project area, including the Theatre site, is also considered sensitive for subsurface prehistoric deposits and historical resources associated with the earliest pre-Gold Rush and Gold Rush-era settlers, as well as material remains of later era residents. Due to the potential for the presence of sub-surface artifacts, this would be considered a ***potentially significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.3-17.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.3-1 would reduce impacts to known and previously undiscovered archaeological resources that could be caused by construction of the SMCS and Theatre projects to a *less-than-significant level* by ensuring that proper procedures are followed in the event any known or unknown resources are unearthed during project construction. (DEIR, p. 6.3-17 to -18.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-17.)

Impact 6.3-2: Construction of the SMCS and Theatre projects could adversely affect the significance of any or all of the following historical resources: Old Tavern, Pioneer Congregational Church, Sutter's Fort, Eastern Star Hall, Capitol Commercial Building, and the residence on the 2600 Block of the Capitol Mansions Historic District. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.3-18.)

Finding: These impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.3-2 and 6.3-3. Impacts resulting from the Theatre will also be less than significant through implementation of Mitigation Measure

6.3-2. Changes or alterations have therefore been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation:
The SMCS Project area is in close proximity to known historical resources that could be adversely affected by the project. Buildings within the SMCS Project area and those in the vicinity that could be affected by development of the various project components were evaluated for significance. (DEIR, p. 6.3-18.) The SMCS Project would involve construction immediately adjacent to two designated historical resources:

- Old Tavern building, and
- Pioneer Congregational Church.

(DEIR, p. 6.3-18.)

The project would also involve construction in the vicinity of the following historical resources:

- Sutter's Fort,
- Eastern Star Hall,
- Capitol Commercial Building, and
- the 2600 Block of the Capitol Mansions Historic District.

(DEIR, p. 6.3-18.)

No designated building, or building which has been evaluated as eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or any contributor to a historic district, would be demolished as a result of the project. Pioneer Church is the only building in a historic district that could be affected by the SMCS Project through construction occurring in close proximity to the Church. (DEIR, pp. 6.3-18 – 6.3-19.)

Construction of the Women's and Children's Center (WCC) would also require new building foundations that would be constructed using drilling equipment for new piles. The building foundations would not be constructed using pile drivers, however. The proposed construction method would be drilling and insertion of piles at specific locations. Drilling, as opposed to pile driving, would cause less ground vibration. However, vibration associated with drilling activities could result in potentially significant adverse effects to historical resources adjacent to and in the vicinity of the project area. Because structures over 50 feet away from drilling activities would not be significantly impacted by vibration caused by construction activities, the number of historic buildings that could be affected by the SMCS Project is limited to the Old Tavern and Pioneer Congressional Church during construction of the WCC and the SMF Building. (DEIR, p. 6.3-19.)

Old Tavern Building

The SMCS Project requires removal of existing non-historic structures that are adjacent to the Old Tavern building to clear the site for construction of the WCC. (DEIR, p. 6.3-19.)

The exposed eastern wall of the Old Tavern building would require rehabilitation after the removal of the adjacent parking structure, which is a component of the SMCS Project. At a minimum it is likely that stabilization and repainting would be necessary. New openings for doors and windows could also be added. The rehabilitation proposes to reflect the current design of the Old Tavern building and draw from existing design elements in order to match the design. (DEIR, p. 6.3-19.)

Pioneer Congregational Church

Vibrations from construction activities associated with the SMCS Project could have significant adverse effects on existing stained glass windows in the Pioneer Congregational Church. Stained glass windows could be vulnerable to damage from vibration from drilling or demolition activities associated with the project. In addition, damage to historic properties could result from the operation of equipment, excess vibration levels or lack of knowledge regarding proper safeguards for protecting and monitoring historic properties. Drilling was used during the construction of the SGH in the mid-1980s and no damage occurred to surrounding properties at that time. (DEIR, p. 6.3-19.)

Sutter's Fort

The Fort consists of four adobe brick walls 18 feet tall and 2 ½ feet thick, enclosing an area of approximately three acres (2 city blocks). The inner courtyard is occupied by a two-story central adobe building and a number of smaller buildings and structures arranged around the interior of the walls. The central building is the only original building to survive from the original 1840 Fort constructed by John Sutter. The adobe brick walls are not reinforced and are therefore vulnerable to outside influences such as construction in the area. The Department of Parks and Recreation has expressed concerns over construction activity within close proximity to the Fort and the potential damage that could result to these adobe structures. (DEIR, pp. 6.3-19 – 6.3-20.)

The SMCS Project would use drilling instead of pile driving during the construction of proposed buildings, which would reduce potential impacts. The potential for significant adverse effects from vibration could potentially have more impact on the adobe brick construction of Sutter's Fort than it would on other structures in the area. Sutter's Fort is not located within 50 feet of any proposed construction; therefore, it is not anticipated that it would be affected. However, Mitigation Measure 6.2-3 (a), detailed below, requires that a study be prepared to assure the nearby structures, such as Sutter's Fort, are not adversely impacted by vibration associated with project construction activities. (DEIR, p. 6.3-20.)

Historic Context and Features

The construction of an 8-story hospital building (WCC) to the east and a 4-story, medical office building (SMF Building) to the west across 28th Street from the Old Tavern Building could alter the setting of the Tavern Building and separate it from the historic streetscape

and adjacent neighborhood. However, there is no existing historic streetscape in this area. The Old Tavern Building is a single historic structure in a modern setting. Development of the WCC and the SMF Building in this location would change the existing environment through the construction of new buildings, but it would not change an existing historic streetscape or remove any designated historic resources. The historic cut-stone curb that exists along 28th Street could be damaged by construction equipment. The design plans for the WCC establish a wide separation between the new construction and the historic Tavern building. This separation is further enhanced by the planned transparency of the first floor/lobby elevation of the WCC minimizing the visual interaction of the two buildings. The SMF Building would replace existing non-historic buildings located along 28th Street with a 4-story structure, similar in height to the Tavern Building.

As discussed above, construction activities could adversely impact the Old Tavern Building including the historic cut-stone curb that exists along the east side of 28th Street and/or the Pioneer Congregational Church. Due to the close proximity of these historic structures to the SMCS project area construction activities could result in a ***potentially significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.3-20.)

Theatre

Vibrations from construction activities associated with the Theater construction could have significant adverse effects on existing stained glass windows in the Trinity Cathedral if it is not demolished prior to the beginning of Theatre construction. Stained glass windows could be vulnerable to damage from construction or demolition activities associated with the project. In addition, damage to historic properties could result from carelessness in the operation of equipment, excess vibration levels or lack of knowledge regarding proper safeguards for protecting and monitoring historic properties. (DEIR, p. 6.3-20.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.3-2 and 6.3-3 would reduce impacts to historical resources that could be caused by demolition and drilling during construction, excavation under or adjacent to existing foundations of the Old Tavern building and Pioneer Congregational Church, or restoration/rehabilitation of the east wall of the Old Tavern building to *less-than-significant levels*. (DEIR, p. 6.3-21 to -22.)

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-20 thru -21.)

Impact 6.3-3: The SMCS Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. (Less than Significant).

(DEIR, p. 6.3-23.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project area is located in a developed urban environment. The various project components would be developed on urban lots, all of which have been developed with

either existing buildings and/or previously contained structures. All of the blocks slated for construction have all been previously disturbed and there are no unique geologic features present at the surface. The abundance and diversity of fossils can potentially vary widely from place to place, with paleontological resource sensitivity likewise varying according to geologic rock unit. However, there are no known paleontological resources within the SMCS Project area. Therefore, this would be a ***less-than-significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.3-23.)

Mitigation Measures: None required. *(DEIR, p. 6.3-23.)*

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-23.)

Impact 6.3-4: The SMCS Project, in combination with other development in the City, could substantially adversely alter archaeological resources, which could result in a significant cumulative impact. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.3-24.)

Finding: This impact can be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.3-4. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: While cumulative development throughout Sacramento would be anticipated to impact resources, it must be noted that many of the areas that are proposed for development are urban in character and have been build upon previously. Earlier development may have destroyed sites, resulting in the inadvertent dispersal or reduction in quality of artifacts or resources. (DEIR, p. 6.3-24.)

Artifacts and other cultural resources have been recorded during prior surveys near the SMCS Project and Theatre areas and throughout the City and County of Sacramento. Therefore, development of the SMCS Project or the Theatre project, in combination with other development in the City of Sacramento, could contribute to the potential loss of significant archaeological and prehistoric resources due to the location near Sutter's Fort and Indian settlements. (DEIR, p. 6.3-24.)

Because all significant cultural resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base.

The loss of any one archaeological site affects all others in a region because these other properties are best understood completely in the context of the cultural system of which they (and the destroyed resource) were a part. The boundaries of an archaeologically important site could extend beyond the property boundaries. (DEIR, p. 6.3-24.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of mitigation measures 6.3-4 and 6.3-1 will ensure that in the event that subsurface resources are discovered, they would be preserved and their treatment would be consistent with professional standards for cultural resources.

Therefore, neither the SMCS Project nor the Theatre project would contribute to the loss of archeological or paleontological resources, and the contribution of either to the cumulative loss would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.3-24, 6.3-16.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-24.)

Impact 6.3-5: The proposed SMCS Project could, in combination with other development in the City, substantially adversely alter historical resources, which could result in a significant cumulative impact. (Less than Significant after Mitigation) (DEIR, p. 6.3-25.)

Finding: This impact will be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.3-5. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: The cumulative context for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on historical resources is the buildout of the City of Sacramento General Plan. Cumulative development in the city could result in the damage or destruction of known historical resources. Sacramento has an array of historical resources. General Plan goals and policies as well as the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance work to prevent the loss of historical resources. (DEIR, p. 6.3-25.) Despite the potential for the cumulative loss of historic structures upon buildout of the Sacramento General Plan, development of the SMCS Project would not result in the loss of significant historical resources or structures. (DEIR, p. 6.3-25.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.2-5, 6.3-2 and 6.3-3 would ensure that precautions are taken during construction to avoid damage to historic structures, that restoration of the Old Tavern is performed to ensure that it retains its unique character, and that the proposed development is designed such that it does not alter the context of the historic districts. Therefore, this measure would ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative alterations in the character of historical resources would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.3-21, 23, 25.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant impact after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-25.)

Impact 6.3-6: The SMCS Project, in combination with other development in the City, could substantially adversely alter paleontological resources, which could result in a significant cumulative impact. (Less than Significant after Mitigation) (DEIR, p. 6.3-26.)

Finding: This impact will be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.3-6. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: While cumulative development throughout Sacramento would be anticipated to impact paleontological resources, many of the areas that are proposed for development are urban in character and have been built upon previously. Earlier development may have destroyed sites, resulting in the inadvertent dispersal or reduction in quality of resources. The development of the proposed project, in combination with other developments in Sacramento, could contribute to the potential for loss of significant paleontological resources. (DEIR, p. 6.3-26.)

Because all paleontological resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resources base. The loss of any one site affects all others in a region because these other properties are best understood completely in the context of the region of which they (and the destroyed resource) were a part. The boundaries of an important site could extend beyond the property boundaries resulting in a ***potentially significant impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.3-26.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of mitigation measure 6.3-6 would ensure that in the event that subsurface resources are discovered, they would be preserved and their treatment would be consistent with professional standards for cultural resources. Therefore, the SMCS Project would not contribute to the loss of paleontological resources, and its contribution to the cumulative loss would be less than considerable resulting in a *less-than-significant cumulative impact.* (DEIR, pp. 6.3-26, 6.3-17.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant cumulative impact after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.3-26.)

4. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Impact 6.4:1:

Existing buildings demolished to accommodate the SMCS Project are known to contain or may contain asbestos or lead-based paint or other hazardous substances, which could be released to the environment during demolition if not properly removed, contained, and transported for disposal at approved sites. (Less than Significant after Mitigation) (DEIR, p. 6.4-21.)

Finding: This impact can be minimized through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: Construction of the SMCS Project would involve the demolition or removal of several buildings. The St. Luke's Office Medical Building, MTI Building, EAP Building, and House of Furs building have been tested and found to contain asbestos-containing building material (ACBM). Only the House of Furs building has been tested for lead-based paint, which was detected in some older parts of the building. Prior to any planned demolition or renovation that may disturb ACBM or lead-based paint, these materials must first be removed and disposed of by a certified contractor, as noted in the test reports for these buildings. (DEIR, p. 6.4-21.)

Because the three other buildings that would be demolished to accommodate the SMCS Project (Energy Center, (former) RAS Building, and a private medical office were constructed between the late 1970s and 1980s, it is unlikely the building components contain asbestos or lead-based paint. However, without test results this cannot be confirmed. Such testing has not been performed to date, so there is the potential demolition of these structures could result in the inadvertent release or improper disposal of debris containing these materials. (DEIR, p. 6.4-21.)
As with asbestos and lead, demolition of structures could result in the inadvertent release or improper disposal of debris containing other hazardous materials, exposure to which can result in adverse human health effects. (DEIR, p. 6.4-21.)

During the occupancy and use of the (former) RAS Building, a 1,300-sf private medical office building, and St. Luke's Medical Office Building, it is possible hazardous substances such as mercury from broken thermometers may be present in sink traps. Other hazardous substances may also have been similarly disposed, leaving residual material in pipes. Testing for the presence of such materials and dismantling of plumbing fixtures would require careful removal techniques to ensure contractors are not inadvertently exposed to hazardous substances. In addition, contaminated debris could be inadvertently disposed of at a landfill or recycling facility not permitted to accept such waste, which could expose workers to potential safety hazards or result in environmental exposure, if hazardous substances are not properly identified in advance.
(DEIR, p. 6.4-21.) Given the types of medical uses and relatively small number of fixtures in these buildings, it is likely the number of fixtures and amount of material potentially containing hazardous substances would be relatively limited, however. (DEIR, p. 6.4-22.)

Theatre

The EAP Building and Trinity Apartments would be demolished to accommodate the proposed Theatre. The EAP Building has been found to contain ACBM, which would require removal by a certified abatement contractor. Due to the age of the building, it may contain lead-based paint. The Trinity Apartments may contain asbestos and/or lead-based paint. Both buildings may contain electrical equipment with PCBs. As described for the SMCS Project, demolition and disposal of material containing hazardous substances could present a health or environmental hazard if not properly managed. (DEIR, p. 6.4-22.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 will ensure that ACBM, lead-based paint, or other hazardous substances in building components are identified, removed, packaged, and disposed of in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations. This would minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances that could adversely affect human health or the environment, thus reducing impacts to a *less-than-significant level.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-22, -23.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-22.)

Impact 6.4-2:

Site preparation activities associated with the SMCS Project (excavation, grading, trenching) have the potential to encounter previously unidentified contaminated soil or groundwater or buried debris that may contain hazardous substances. (Less than Significant after Mitigation). (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Finding: This impact will be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-2. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: Buildings within the SMCS proposed for below-grade construction activities include: the Community Parking Structure, Future Medical Office Building, SMF Building, the Women and Children's Center, and connector tunnels. Excavations for these structures would disturb soil and may encounter groundwater. The results of Phase 1 ESAs indicate there are no known soil or groundwater contamination issues at the site, and the locations of known USTs have been determined. (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Although the project applicant has no knowledge of such occurrences, the potential exists for historic site uses to have resulted in undocumented releases of hazardous substances to soil or groundwater. For example, items such as old heating fuel USTs predate current permitting and regulatory requirements, so the location(s) of such features may not be known. Leaks from old tanks could have resulted in a release of petroleum products to soil or groundwater. The accidental discovery of unknown hazards during excavation and inadvertent release of hazardous materials could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment if measures are not in place to safely manage such occurrences. This was considered a ***potentially significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Should contamination be detected in areas to be disturbed, in areas directly adjacent to sites to be developed, or in areas open to public access, remediation of the contaminated areas would be necessary in most cases. Remediation would include, at a minimum, treatment of contaminated soils in a manner that would render them non-hazardous or otherwise protect public health and safety. Proper treatment and/or disposal of soils and groundwater could also be required. As discussed in Impact 6.5-2 in Section 6.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, the City has specific requirements for the disposal of contaminated groundwater. (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Potential adverse impacts of remediation would be mitigated, in part, by legally required safety and hazardous waste handling and transportation precautions. For hazardous waste workers, OSHA regulations mandate an initial 40-hour training course and subsequent annual training review. Additionally, site-specific training would be required for some workers. In responsible agency review of mitigation plans, procedures for protection of the public during remediation would be evaluated. These measures, along with application of state and regional cleanup standards, would serve to protect human health and environment during site remediation, thus minimizing remediation impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Remediation of contaminated sites would eliminate the health threats posed by hazardous

wastes and prevent workers and the public from encountering such materials in the event of any future excavation at the site. Removal of the toxic materials would also eliminate a potential local source of groundwater contamination; therefore, removal would be beneficial in the long run. Proper handling and disposal of excavated contaminated material would preempt potential health, safety, or environmental effects of the contaminated soil or groundwater. (DEIR, p. 6.4-23.)

Theatre

Construction of the Theatre could involve site preparation activities such as excavation, grading, and possibly dewatering. During such activities, contaminated soil or groundwater, underground storage tanks, or other hazardous debris could be encountered, as described for the SMCS Project. Unless properly managed, construction and remediation could create a health hazard. This is considered to be a ***potentially significant impact.*** (DEIR, pp. 6.4-24.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-2 will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels by requiring site inspections at each location to determine the likelihood of contaminants within the site boundaries, removal or remediation of hazardous materials, and appropriate conditions outlining procedures in the event that previously unknown hazardous debris, soil, or groundwater contamination is discovered during construction. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce construction-related impacts associated with exposure to hazardous materials to a *less-than-significant level.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-24, 25.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-25.)

Impact 6.4-3:

Construction and operation of the SMCS Project would result in the continued routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-25.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Implementation of the SMCS Project would not create a significant hazard to the public, employees or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. All non-medical activities discussed in the Draft EIR would not require the use of hazardous materials to the extent which would create a significant impact. All medical activities would be regulated by federal, State, and local laws that are incorporated into SMCS's Environment of Care Manual. The WCC Building and a portion of the SMF Building, moreover, would be

surveyed for hospital-based services every three years by JCAHO and the California Department of Health Services (Licensing & Certification) to ensure compliance with JCAHO standards and California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22 (Hospital Licensing and Certification) regulations, which include hazardous materials management provisions. Therefore, construction or operation of the SMCS Project would have a ***less-than-significant impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.4-26 thru 28.)

The following describes the construction and operational features of the proposed project and how hazardous materials exposure could occur and methods to control such exposures.

Construction

Construction of the SMCS Project would involve the use of various products that could contain materials classified as hazardous (e.g., solvents, adhesives and cements, certain paints, cleaning agents and degreasers). Fuels, such as gasoline and diesel, would also be used in heavy equipment and other construction vehicles. The use and storage of such products is subject to applicable hazardous materials regulations, and contract specifications would contain specific provisions regarding the use of these products to ensure compliance with applicable regulations and standards. Because applicable hazardous materials laws and regulations would be implemented as standard procedure for construction of the proposed project through contractor specifications and monitored by the applicant, the impact of construction-related hazardous chemical use and storage would be less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.4-26.)

Medical Facilities Operation

Occupancy and operation of the medical buildings proposed for development by SMCS

would require the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, while the non-medical buildings would rarely contain or require hazardous materials. Similar to existing conditions with Sutter General Hospital and the Buhler Building, the proposed WCC and SMF Building would involve the use of hazardous materials in research, patient care, and routine maintenance and repair activities. Such materials would include a variety of chemicals, radioactive materials, and maintenance products. Biohazardous materials and medical wastes, along with chemical and radioactive waste, would be generated. (DEIR, p. 6.4-27.)

The use of hazardous materials would not be a new use at the site when the proposed facilities become occupied. However, because there would be a net increase in patients diagnosed and treated at the site, as compared to existing conditions, there would be an increase in the amount of materials used on-site. The types of materials would not change substantially, and the materials would generally be stored in small, individual containers of about five gallons or less except for the few HMP-reportable products that are stored in

large quantities. Therefore, the probability of a major hazardous materials incident would be relatively low. Minor incidents would be more likely, but the consequences of such accidents would probably not be severe due to the typically small quantities of materials handled at any particular time and the equipment and training provided to SMCS facilities staff. (DEIR, p. 6.4-27.)

The project-related effects of hazardous materials handling and storage would generally be limited to the immediate areas where the materials would be located, because this is where exposure would be most likely. For this reason, the individuals most at risk would be hospital employees or others in the immediate vicinity of the hazardous materials. While the use and handling of hazardous materials would increase in accordance with the increase in patients, strict rules and regulations minimize the risk of public exposure to hazardous materials. As part of its standard procedures, the WCC and SMF Building would implement Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) programs like those already in use at SGH. EHS programs are designed for compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and accreditation standards, for the safety of patients, staff, and visitors, and to protect the environment. As with the existing facilities, the Environment of Care Manual would continue to direct how hazardous materials (including wastes) are managed at the new facilities developed as part of the SMCS Project. The health and safety procedures that protect workers and other individuals in the immediate vicinity of hazardous materials would also protect the adjacent community and environment. (DEIR, p. 6.4-27.)

SMCS maintains an emergency response plan to ensure that staff can respond to possible hazardous materials emergencies. In general, spills of less than one-half to one liter (about two to four quarts) are cleaned up by hospital staff. For some materials (e.g., formaldehyde), spills larger than one-half liter are required to be cleaned up by an outside hazardous materials team. The City Fire Department provides "first response" capabilities to identify and secure access to hazardous materials incidents. The Fire Department HazMat team has not been called upon to respond to any hazardous materials spill incidents at existing SGH or Buhler Building facilities within the last five years. Only one incident involving a release of hazardous materials to the environment has occurred at the SGH, which involved ethylene oxide (EtO). EtO is a gas that was used in sterilizing equipment and is classified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC). The incident did not require HazMat team response, but several agencies, including the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, were involved in subsequent enforcement actions. The use of EtO has been discontinued (see Impact 6.2-6 in Section 6.2, Air Quality), and current methods involve the use of steam and hydrogen peroxide, as noted in the Environmental Setting in this section. Other jurisdictions are available, if necessary, to support the City through mutual aid agreements. The increase in hazardous materials use would not substantially affect the demand for hazardous materials emergency response services in Sacramento and would not substantially affect the availability or response times of emergency responders because the types of hazardous materials used would not change, only amounts kept at the proposed project. The likelihood of emergency incidents is more a function of the types of materials used as opposed to the quantities of materials used. Because the types of materials used would be similar in the future, SMCS's current emergency response plan would still be effective at responding to anticipated incidents associated with hazardous materials. (DEIR, p. 6.4-27-6.4-28.)

Aside from accidents possibly occurring on site, accidents during hazardous materials

transport to and from the site could expose individuals and the environment to risks at some distance from the project site. Transportation of hazardous materials could increase the risk of exposure to workers and the public through accidental spills due to transportation-related accidents. However, transportation accidents are infrequent. According to the California Department of Transportation, less than 3.12 vehicle accidents occur for every million vehicle miles traveled on major undivided urban highways. The frequency is substantially less on other types of urban highways. Moreover, DOT, USPS, and the California Department of Health Services Radiologic Health Branch and Medical Waste Program all specify packaging requirements for hazardous materials and wastes that limit the potential for packages to fail on impact. CHP regulations set forth requirements for testing of shipping containers, marking containers and vehicles, inspecting vehicles, and training drivers. These requirements reduce the potential for hazardous materials releases to occur in the unlikely event of an accident involving transportation of hazardous material to or from the project. (DEIR, p. 6.4-28.)

Energy Center

A new 11,000-gallon liquid oxygen tank and 3,000-gallon reserve tank would be located on the west side of the proposed SMF Building (see Figure 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description). The tanks would be surrounded by a 22-foot-high concrete wall; a portion of the wall would be metal louvers. The enclosure would be open at the top to provide adequate ventilation. As noted in the Environmental Setting, oxygen is not considered an acutely hazardous or toxic material and is nonflammable. It would be contained in pressurized tanks with leak control devices in a well-ventilated area. Tank design, installation, and operation would be subject to review by the City Fire Department to ensure compliance with applicable Uniform Fire Code requirements. Consequently, there is no evidence the tank would pose a significant health risk to nearby schools or the adjacent playground due to the release of a hazardous substance. (DEIR, p. 6.4-28.)

Relocation of the Energy Center and increased capacity would result in an increase in the amount of water treatment chemicals. This would represent an increase over existing conditions, but it would not introduce new or different chemical products compared to those currently in use and for which no special permitting or handling is required. Fuel tanks for the new Energy Center would be located underground, which would minimize the risk of accident or upset that could release hazardous materials to the environment where people could be directly exposed. (DEIR, p. 6.4-28.)

Theatre

The Theatre would be used for theatrical purposes that typically do not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Common household-type chemicals may be used and stored within the site but these chemicals would not lead to a significant hazard to people or the environment. Therefore, this is considered a ***less-than-significant impact.*** (DEIR, pp. 6.4-29.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-29.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-29.)

Impact 6.4-4:

Implementation of the SMCS Project would involve the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-29.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project area is located within one-quarter mile of four schools, as described in the Environmental Setting section. The closest school is approximately 150 feet west of the proposed SMF Building. (DEIR, p. 6.4-29.)

Demolition of existing structures has the potential to release asbestos or lead-based paint into the air, which could migrate to nearby schools. As discussed in Impact 6.4-1, specific mitigation measures have been identified to minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances. The potential for releases of hazardous substances during site preparation is described in Impact 6.4-2. Mitigation Measures identified for these impacts would be sufficient to reduce potential hazards at the school sites, and no additional mitigation is required. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

As discussed in Impact 6.4-3, construction and operation of the proposed project would involve the routine use and storage of hazardous materials within the SMCS Project. Construction would temporarily and intermittently involve the use of products that may have hazardous properties, but construction site controls would limit the potential for hazardous substances to affect school properties. The use of hazardous materials would not be a new use at the site when the proposed facilities become occupied. However, because there would be a net increase in patients diagnosed and treated at the site, as compared to existing conditions, there would be an increase in the amount of materials used on-site, which would also increase the amount of hazardous waste. The types of hazardous materials would not change, however. As stated in Impact 6.4-3, hazardous materials (including wastes) would be managed at the new facilities in accordance with established protocols. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

An 11,000-gallon liquid oxygen tank and 3,000-gallon reserve tank would be located on the west side of the proposed SMF Building (see Figure 2-11) about 150 feet east of the Montessori School and an outdoor play area. The tanks would be surrounded by 22-foot-high concrete wall; a portion of the wall would be metal louvers. For the reasons outlined in Impact 6.4-3, there is no evidence the tanks would pose a significant health risk to nearby schools or the adjacent playground due to the release of a hazardous substance. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

The relocated Energy Center would include two new USTs. Fuel would be stored underground, and there would be leak-detection devices. This would not pose a health risk to nearby schools. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

Some of the hospital operations would involve processes that could emit toxic air contaminants (TACs), as discussed in Impact 6.2-6 in Section 6.2, Air Quality. TAC emissions already occur from existing facilities, but the types of emissions are not considered acutely hazardous by the SCAQMD, and the concentrations of emissions are not at levels that would pose a significant health risk. Development of the SMF Building, WCC Building, new medical offices, and operation of the relocated and expanded Energy Center could result in an increase in TAC emissions over existing conditions, but not to levels where that would pose a health risk to nearby schools (see Impact 6.2-6 in Section 6.2, Air Quality). (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

In summary, while hazardous materials, substances, or waste would be handled within the SMCS Project within ¼ mile of four schools, including an outdoor play area, impacts would considered ***less than significant*** for the reasons discussed above. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

Theatre

Products used in theaters typically include common items such as paints, glues, and cleaning compounds for set construction. Common household chemicals such as cleaning agents (soap products and degreasers) may be used and stored within the site for maintenance. Neither the types nor quantities of these materials would be substantial. Routine use of these products would not lead to a significant hazard to people or the environment within ¼ mile of a school. Therefore this is a ***less-than-significant impact***. (DEIR, pp. 6.4-30.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-30.)

Impact 6.4-5: The SMCS Project proposed helistop would not result in substantial safety risks due to helicopter operations. However, the design of the proposed helistop serving the Women's and Children's Center could be inconsistent with Section 12.92.070 of the Sacramento City Code pertaining to helistop design. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.) Nevertheless, a voluntary measure has been incorporated into the project to ensure that the potential effects of the project remain less than significant.

Explanation: The SMCS Project proposes to construct a helistop on top of the southern section of the WCC Building. The helistop, which would be a new use at the project site, would be used for scheduled transfers of infants, children, and adults. SMCS would not operate life-flight emergency services from the helistop. Helicopters would not be housed, parked, or refueled at this site, but would only drop off patients and return to a remote base. It is anticipated there would be approximately 150-200 take-offs/landings per year, or an average of about 15 to 20 landings/take-offs per month. (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

A permit for helistop operations is required from the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, along with land use approvals from the City of Sacramento and the Sacramento Airport Land Use Commission. Caltrans Division of Aeronautics would also be responsible for ensuring FAA requirements are satisfied before approving SMCS's permit application for the helistop. (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

The SMCS Project would not, in and of itself, generate new helicopter flights in the metropolitan Sacramento area. The environmental effect of the SMCS Project would be to place helicopter operations (take-offs and landings) in closer proximity to existing developed land uses than if the proposed helistop were not constructed. Helistop operation would also result in approach and departure paths in an area that does not currently have such operations. (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

The use of the proposed helistop on the roof of the WCC Building by medical transport helicopters is not considered to present a substantial safety risk to the project site or adjacent land uses for several reasons, which are discussed below. The discussion presents some general information about helicopter safety, followed by information specific to the proposed SMCS helistop. (DEIR, p. 6.4-31.)

Helicopter Safety and Risk

Some amount of risk is associated with helicopter operations. The degree of risk is measured by the frequency of occurrence (how often), potential consequences (severity of the accident), and spatial distribution (where the accident occurs). In 2001, the accident rate for helicopter emergency medical service (EMS) helicopter operations was estimated to be 5.97 accidents per 100,000 flight hours. This is less than the accident rate helicopter aviation in general (7.64 accidents per 100,000 flight hours). The EMS helicopter rates have remained below the accident rates for both general aviation and all helicopter operations. Fatalities (crew and passengers) have experienced a similar decline. From a high of nearly 10 fatal accidents per 100,000 flight hours in 1980, the rate has decreased to approximately 2 fatal accidents per 100,000 flight hours in 2001. (DEIR, p. 6.4-32.)

In general, aviation operations are more prone to accidents or incidents during take-offs or landings than during the cruise portion of the flight. However, this is not the case with helicopter emergency medical service operations.

Accidents do happen at rooftop hospital heliports/helipads, but they are rare. Where

accidents occurred at rooftop facilities, the NTSB identified pilot error as the probable cause in most cases. During the period 1998 through March 2005, there have been few fatal accidents involving hospital rooftop helipads. (DEIR, p. 6.4-32.) The statistical data summarized above show that while some risk exists with EMS helicopter operations at a hospital rooftop helipad (or helistop), the risk is not substantial. (DEIR, p. 6.4-32.)

Proposed SMCS Helistop Operations

Collisions with objects is one of a number of causes of helicopter accidents. An important Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) for protecting aircraft during the landing and takeoff phases of flights is FAR Part 77 (14 CFR 77), which establishes height standards for objects near a landing area. The helistop's approach and departure flight paths are not adversely affected by obstructions. Therefore, the standards of FAR Part 77 are satisfied at the SMCS site. (DEIR, p. 6.4-32.)

The primary flight path would be arrivals from the northeast, along the Capital City Freeway. Departures would be along Capital City Freeway to the southwest, towards the U.S. Highway 50/State Route 99 interchange. This would occur when winds are from the south/southwest, which is the prevailing wind direction in Sacramento. This is also the optimum condition in terms of aircraft performance and safety. When winds are from the north, the flight paths would be reversed (arrivals from the southwest and departures to the northeast). This would be the secondary route. Federal aviation regulations do allow helicopter pilots to divert from established routes when necessary for safety of flight. The primary and secondary arrival/departure paths would not be over existing residential neighborhoods, schools, or churches. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33.)

Feasibility planning for the proposed helistop indicates there are no existing buildings or structures within the approach zones that would obstruct airspace, and the height of the proposed WCC would not create an obstruction to helicopters using the helistop. In addition, the 8:1 approach/departure slope with the 4,000-foot approach path required by State and local regulations can be achieved with no obstruction hazards. Therefore, there would be no substantial contribution to increased risk of accident because of obstructions. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33.)

From a siting and regulatory perspective, the FAA does not prohibit heliports (or helistops) adjacent to freeways or highways, so there would be no conflict with that agency's requirements. The City Code (Section 12.92.030) allows helistops to be erected on buildings (with a special use permit), which is consistent with the City's General Plan policy for siting. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33.)

Helicopter approaches and departures to the helistop would be visible to passing motorists on the freeway. However, the proposed helistop on the WCC is approximately 167 feet above the ground, which is higher than the elevated freeway and adjacent buildings, and it would be the tallest building at the SMCS Project. Because of the height and distance from the freeway, helicopter take-offs and landings would not be a distractive hazard to motorists. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33.)

Helicopter landing tests at other local hospitals have demonstrated that while people may notice helicopter operations, there was no observed effect on pedestrian or vehicle traffic patterns or increased rate of vehicle accidents while helicopters were operating.

Simulated approach and takeoff operations to the proposed SMCS helistop site were conducted on three separate occasions (two daytime and one night) without any noticeable effect on freeway traffic. As noted in the Environmental Setting, helicopter operations are common throughout the downtown area and people have become accustomed to their presence in an urban environment. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33.)

Consistency with Design Criteria

The FAA has established design standards that are specific to the actual landing area at hospital helistops and helipads to protect public safety and property. These standards are current as of September 2004. (DEIR, p. 6.4-33 - 6.4-34.)

The City of Sacramento's Helicopter Ordinance is in the process of being updated to conform to federal and Caltrans requirements. When the City's ordinance is updated, SMCS's helistop would be consistent with federal, State, and local (City of Sacramento) design criteria. In the event the ordinance is not modified prior to City action on the SMCS Project, the SMCS Project would be considered inconsistent. However, this is not considered a significant impact because specific design criteria established by the FAA would continue to apply. The amendment to Section 12.92.070 of the City Code pertaining to the size of the "touchdown area" would not result in any significant environmental effects. (DEIR, p. 6.4-35.)

Mitigation Measure: Although not required, implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-3, in the event that the City has not amended Section 12.92.070 of the City Code, will ensure consistency with applicable City regulations and that the potential impacts remain less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.4-35.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-35.)

Impact 6.4-6: Implementation of the SMCS Project could interfere with emergency response and/or emergency evacuation plans. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-35.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: During construction of individual projects, it may be necessary to restrict travel on certain roadways within the SMCS Project area to facilitate construction activities

such as demolition, material hauling, construction, staging, and modifications to existing

infrastructure. Such restrictions could include lane closures, lane narrowing, and detours, which would be temporary but could continue for extended periods of time. In the event of an emergency, emergency response access or response times could be adversely affected. These impacts would occur during the construction period and would not be permanent.

The City of Sacramento requires the project applicant prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan in accordance with Sections 12.20.020 and 12.20.030 of the Sacramento City Code. The plan must be approved by the City Public Works or Utilities Director prior to any work that would obstruct vehicular or pedestrian traffic on any City Street. (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)
In conjunction with project development, L Street would be narrowed to accommodate construction of WCC; however, it would not prevent, impede, or impair implementation of an evacuation plan, because it is not a designated evacuation route. (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)

The SMCS Project would also create some elevated pedestrian walkways between SMCS facilities. This would decrease pedestrian traffic on local roadways, which could allow for faster and safer emergency vehicle use or evacuation through the project site. This is a ***less-than-significant impact***, and no additional mitigation is required. (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)

Theatre

During construction of the Children's Theatre, it may be necessary to restrict travel on nearby roadways to facilitate construction activities. Such restrictions could include lane closures, lane narrowing, and detours, which may be temporary or continue for extend ed periods of time. Lane restrictions, closures, and/or detours could cause an increase in traffic volumes on adjacent roadways. Due to the relatively small size of the Theatre project, traffic restrictions would generally be minor and temporary. As described for the SMCS Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan must be prepared and approved by the City prior to work that would obstruct vehicle or pedestrian traffic. No permanent roadway modifications are contemplated for the Theatre. (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-36.)

Impact 6.4-7: The SMCS Project, in combination with other development in the City of Sacramento, would result in the demolition of existing buildings. This demolition and other site preparation activities could result in a release of hazardous materials to the environment thus exposing the public to potential health risks. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-37.)

Finding: This impact can be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-5. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant short-term

environmental effect as identified in the DEIR.

Explanation: For any project in the City of Sacramento that would develop or redevelop an existing site where hazardous building materials such as asbestos or lead-based paint is present, the potential exists for release of hazardous materials during demolition/renovation of those sites. Previously unidentified soil or groundwater contamination or buried items containing hazardous substances (e.g., USTs) could also be encountered during excavation and other site preparation activities. For individuals not involved in demolition/construction activities, the greatest potential source of exposure to contaminants would be airborne emissions, primarily through construction-generated dust from demolition or grading. Other potential pathways, such as direct contact with contaminated materials would not pose as great a risk to the public because such exposure scenarios would typically be confined to the demolition/construction zones. This assumption is based on implementation of site-specific risk management controls and compliance with applicable laws and regulations pertaining to site cleanup and hazardous materials management at locations in the areas surrounding the project site. Moreover, an individual who is directly outside the demolition/construction zone of one source of hazardous materials would be unlikely to be exposed to maximum levels from another source. Such exposure would typically be site-specific and would involve accidental or inadvertent exposure to hazardous building materials. Associated health and safety risks would generally be limited to those individuals working with the hazardous building materials or to persons in the project site.

Furthermore, such impacts would only be temporary and intermittent. The cumulative effect would be a ***potentially significant short-term impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.4-37.)

Mitigation Measures:

Compliance with Mitigation Measures 6.4-5, 6.4-1 and 6.4-2 would reduce all cumulative impacts to a *less-than-significant level*. (DEIR, pp. 6.4-37; 6.4-31.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant after mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-37.)

Impact 6.4-8: The SMCS Project, in combination with other development in the City of Sacramento, could increase the risk of exposure of people to hazards due to increased volume and type of hazardous materials used, transported, stored, and disposed in the City. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-38.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The construction and operation of current and future projects within the City of Sacramento, including projects within ¼ mile of a school, would continue to involve the use of hazardous materials. Projects that use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials would be required to comply with federal, State and local regulations to ensure the safe handling of these materials. Due to strict regulation, the risk of release or exposure to

hazardous materials within Sacramento would be minimized. Associated health and safety risks would generally be limited to those individuals using the materials or to persons in the immediate vicinity of the materials. Although the risk of accident or inadvertent releases cannot be completely avoided, hazardous materials incidents would typically be site-specific, generally one-tim e occurrences that would not combine with similar effects elsewhere. Implementation of applicable hazardous materials management laws and regulations adopted at the federal, State, and local level, which are monitored by the City of Sacramento and SCEMD, would ensure cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials use remain **less than significant**. (DEIR, p. 6.4-38.)

Hazardous materials use at the SMCS Project would increase; however, some of the increase in hazardous materials use would be attributable to the relocation of services from the existing Sutter Memorial Hospital in East Sacramento rather than a new use in Sacramento. Because the proposed project's net contribution to this cumulative impact would be a small increment, the project's contribution would be ***less than cumulatively considerable*** and, thus, less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.4-38.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-38.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than cumulatively considerable, and thus, less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-38.)

Impact 6.4-9: Implementation of the SMCS Project, in combination with existing and anticipated development in the Sacramento metropolitan area, would increase the number of permitted helistops, heliports, and helipads. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-39.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: There are several permitted helistops, heliports, and helipads in the greater Sacramento area. The Caltrans Division of Aeronautics is also reviewing applications for proposed helipads at two other local hospitals. The proposed SMCS helistop would increase the number of helistops in the region. Helicopters transporting patients would occur regardless of whether the SMCS Project is implemented. The SMCS Project would provide an additional location for patient transfers within the region, but it would not increase the number of helicopter trips. (DERI, p. 6.4-39.)

Each facility must be permitted by Caltrans and secure all required land use approvals. Approach and departure paths are established for each facility, and the use of airspace over Sacramento is governed by federal and state regulations, which applies to helicopter

flights. The frequency, location, and severity of helipad accidents (which are extremely rare) at any one location would be site-specific and would be limited to the immediate vicinity. As such, take-off and landing accidents would not combine to create a cumulative effect for the SMCS Project. Therefore, the impact is not cumulatively considerable and would result in a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***. (DERI, p. 6.4-39.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-39.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-39.)

Impact 6.4-10: The SMCS Project, in combination with development in the City of Sacramento, could interfere with emergency response plans and/or emergency evacuation plans. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.4-40.)

Finding: No mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Construction-related activities and developments within the City of Sacramento that alter, close, or in other ways affect traffic on area roadways could interfere with emergency response access or response times or affect evacuation routes. Construction-related activities of the SMCS Project would contribute to this effect. If project restrictions coincide with other closures from adjacent projects, emergency response access or response times could be adversely affected. The City requires all project applicants to prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan for projects that would obstruct vehicle traffic. This would allow the City to manage affected roadways so that effects would not be cumulatively considerable. The impact is considered a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***. No additional mitigation is required. (DEIR, p. 6.4-40.)

Theatre

As discussed for the SMCS Project, cumulative construction traffic impacts would not be significant. No roadway modifications are proposed for the Theatre project that could combine with similar effects elsewhere. There would be ***no impact***. (DEIR, p. 6.4-40.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.4-40.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.4-40.)

5. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact 6.5-1: Implementation of the SMCS Project could result in an increase in the rate and amount of stormwater runoff from the project area, which could cause or exacerbate flood conditions on- or off-site. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-9.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3),

15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project is proposed for development on land that currently contains urban development consisting primarily of impervious surfaces. Development of the SMCS Project is expected to increase the amount of impervious surfaces by approximately 16,000 square feet, or approximately 0.37 acre. The City has recently adopted the Combined System Development Fee Ordinance that requires a development fee for projects within the CSS Service boundary. (DEIR, p. 6.5-9.)

The project area is drained by the CSS, which is considered an impacted system due to its lack of available capacity during storm events. During dry weather conditions, the CSS has enough available capacity to handle the total flow, which is primarily composed of sewage. During storm events, the combination of sewage and stormwater runoff has the potential to create localized street flooding. Absent system improvements, however, flooding and CSOs would continue. (DEIR, p. 6.5-9.)

Compliance with the City's Combined System Development Fee ordinance would reduce the project impact by providing (1) additional capacity in the City's system to reduce the potential for flooding and CSOs system-wide, or (2) requiring storage of project flows to ensure that the SMCS Project would not contribute to flooding and CSOs. This would reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level***. (DEIR, p. 6.5-10.)

Theatre

The total area of the five parcels that comprise the proposed theatre location is approximately 38,500 square feet. The site currently contains impervious surfaces associated with the Trinity Apartments, EAP Building, an existing surface parking lot, and a vacant lot containing pervious surface, which account for approximately 30,000 square feet of surface coverage. There is one undeveloped lot about 1,700 square feet in size. (DEIR, p. 6.5-10.)

Assuming land coverage shown in Figure 2-1 of the Draft EIR for the proposed Theatre site, it is likely there could be a small increase in impervious surfaces generating stormwater runoff – on the order of approximately 3,000 square feet, but no more than 8,500 square feet. The net increase in impervious surface would not be any greater than 0.25 acre (10,980 square feet). Therefore, increases in stormwater flows from the Theatre site would not be substantial enough to cause or exacerbate capacity exceedences in the CSS that could cause localized flooding. This impact is considered ***less than significant***. (DEIR, p. 6.5-10.)

Mitigation Measures: ***None required.*** **(DEIR, p. 6.5-10)**

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-10.)

Impact 6.5-2: Stormwater runoff from the SMCS Project would contain urban pollutants that could be discharged to the Sacramento River, which could affect surface water quality. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-10.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project would be developed on land that currently contains urban development consisting primarily of impervious surfaces (parking lots, building rooftops, hardscaping, and roadways). Stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces on the project site is currently conveyed to the CSS. Stormwater runoff within project area is currently collected by the CSS and transported to the SRWTP or CWTP for treatment before discharging into the Sacramento River. The CSS and WTPs operate under current NPDES permits regulated by the CVRWQCB. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-10 – 6.5-11.)

Development of the SMCS Project would generate only a small net increase in stormwater runoff conveyed to the CSS (see Impact 6.8-7 in Section 6.8, Utility Systems of Draft EIR). The types and concentrations of pollutants are not expected to vary significantly from existing conditions. At some locations, there could actually be a decrease in certain pollutants such as oil and grease and metals carried in stormwater runoff. (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Modifications, if any, to the storm drain inlet locations and sizing to accommodate the SMCS Project would include stormwater quality BMPs, consistent with the City's NPDES stormwater permit requirements and features in the existing system. This would ensure urban pollutants generated by the SMCS Project would continue to be managed in accordance with State and local regulations. (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Because the SMCS Project would not result in a substantial net increase in urban pollutants in stormwater runoff and would include stormwater quality BMPs, discharges from the SMCS Project would not violate any water quality standards, exceed wastewater discharge requirements, or otherwise degrade water quality, and impacts would be ***less than significant***. (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Theatre

The Theatre site lies within the SMCS Project area and currently contains impervious surfaces associated with the Trinity Apartments, EAP Building, and two existing surface parking lots, along with a vacant lot containing pervious surface. As described in Impact 6.5-1, there would not be a substantial net increase in runoff. Because parking areas, which typically contain grease and metals, would be converted to building surfaces, there could be a decrease in these pollutants from the site. Therefore, Sacramento River water quality would not be adversely affected. Impacts would be ***less than significant.*** (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-11.)

Impact 6.5-3: Groundwater from construction and foundation dewatering would be discharged to the City's CSS, which could result in CSS capacity and water quality impacts. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-12.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Because some excavation activities of the SMCS Project could reach levels at or below the depth of groundwater, dewatering activities are anticipated. During construction, it may be necessary to remove groundwater from these excavations because of the shallow water table. During construction dewatering, shallow groundwater may contain sediment that, if discharged to the treatment plant, could affect plant operating conditions. (DEIR, p. 6.5-12.)

Permanent foundation dewatering systems are in place for some of the existing structures in the project site. During the life of the project, shallow groundwater could infiltrate subsurface walls and foundations, potentially causing structural damage unless groundwater is removed. Preliminary engineering estimates indicate the WCC would add approximately 33,000 square feet of foundation requiring dewatering, resulting in approximately 100 to 278 gallons per minute (gpm) to be discharged to the CSS. An existing pump that serves the Energy Center would be eliminated, and a new pump would be added to serve the south half of the SGH. A foundation dewatering system for the proposed SMF Building and new Energy Center is not anticipated. (DEIR, p. 6.5-12.)

The City of Sacramento requires that any discharges of groundwater from construction foundation or basement dewatering be permitted through the City Utilities Department. The applicant has submitted a written request to the City to expand the underground dewatering systems to accommodate the design of the proposed WCC, which take into account the site-specific concerns summarized above. All groundwater discharges to the sewer must also obtain a discharge permit from the SRCSD Industrial Waste Section. These requirements would be made part of the construction contract specifications and confirmed by City staff through the building permit process. The applicant has been coordinating with City Utilities staff to identify solutions to the hydrostatic pressure issues associated with existing and new construction. (DEIR, p. 6.5-13.)

As discussed in Impact 6.4-2 in Section 6.4, Hazards and Public Safety, there are no known groundwater contamination issues at the site, so it is not anticipated that contaminated groundwater would be encountered during dewatering. However, part of the permitting process includes an assessment of groundwater quality. Should contaminants be detected in groundwater proposed for discharge to the CSS that were not previously detected, the City would require the applicant to initiate actions to control contaminant levels during dewatering. (DEIR, p. 6.5-13.)

The purpose of these requirements is to ensure project dewatering discharges to the CSS do not temporarily or permanently reduce system capacity to levels at which overflows or outflows could occur and to protect influent and effluent water quality at the treatment plants. Such measures are necessary for the City to comply with adopted NPDES permits. Because there is an established regulatory mechanism in place that is enforced by the City and that would be applicable to the proposed project, the SMCS Project would not

violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or cause exceedances of CSS capacity. (DEIR, p. 6.5-13.)

Theatre

If dewatering is required for the Children's Theatre of California construction or long-term operation, that project would be required to comply with the City's dewatering policy, as discussed for the SMCS Project. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-13.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-13.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-13.)

Impact 6.5-4: Wastewater flows from the SMCS Project would contain chemicals, radioactive materials, and chemotherapeutic wastes that would be discharged to the Sacramento River via the CSS and SRWTP, which could affect water quality. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-14.)

Finding: Less than Significant. No mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Implementation of the SMCS Project would result in a net increase of 0.15 mgd of wastewater to the CSS system (see Impact 6.8-6 in Section 6.8, Public Utilities in the Draft EIR). Because the types of patient care and routine hospital functions would not differ substantially from existing conditions (other than an increase in the number of patients and facility space), the chemical characteristics of wastewater discharged to the sewer would not be expected to differ substantially. Therefore, the SMCS Project would not adversely affect the NPDES discharge limitations for the SRWTP or the CWTP such that adverse effects on Sacramento River water quality would occur. (DEIR, p. 6.5-14; see also *Environment of Care Manual* "Hazardous Chemical Waste Management Program" (describing the procedures for the disposal of hazardous chemicals, radioactive waste, and chemotherapeutic waste within its facilities).)

The existing Energy Center uses water to generate chilled water and steam. Various products are used to treat the water to maintain proper water chemistry. These products include algicides, biocides, and anti-scaling chemicals. Wastewater containing low levels of these chemicals is discharged to the CSS. The capacity of the Energy Center would be increased to accommodate additional demand of the SMCS Project. This would result in an increase in the amount of water used in the system and a commensurate increase in the amount of chemicals used. This would not be a new discharge, and no change is anticipated in the types of chemicals, as compared to existing conditions, that would substantially affect the quality of water entering the sewer and treated at the treatment plants for which NPDES permits have been granted. The applicant's engineer has indicated that a permit for the increased wastewater discharge from the proposed new Energy Center would not be required, indicating that the types and levels of constituents in

the wastewater would not be likely to affect the NDPES discharge limitations imposed by the CVRWQCB on either the SRCSD or CWTP plants. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-14 – 6.5-15.)

Theatre

The proposed theatre would not discharge any wastewater to the sewer other than domestic wastewater. There would be ***no impact.*** (DEIR, p. 6.5-15.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-15.)

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-15.)

Impact 6.5-5: The project, in combination with cumulative development in the CSS service area, would generate stormwater runoff that could result in localized flooding. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-15.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The City's CSS is considered an impacted system due to its lack of available capacity during storm events. During dry weather conditions, the CSS has enough available capacity to handle the total flow, which is primarily composed of sewage. During storm events, the combination of sewage and stormwater runoff has the potential to create localized street flooding. Additional runoff from development within the CSS service area, including the SMCS Project, could contribute to localized street flooding related to the exceedance of the system's capacity. (DEIR, p. 6.5-15.)

The Department of Utilities has completed several CSS Improvement and Rehabilitation Program projects, including construction of new regional storage projects, and numerous rehabilitation and replacement projects throughout the system. The City continues to undertake improvements according to the program, including additional storage facilities, and the improvement and expansion of existing facilities. Compliance with the City's Combined System Development Fee ordinance would reduce the project's potential cumulative impact by providing (1) additional capacity in the City's system to reduce the potential for flooding and CSOs system-wide, or (2) requiring storage of project flows to ensure that the SMCS Project would not contribute to flooding and CSOs. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-15-6.5-16.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-16.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is a less than significant cumulative impact without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-16.)

Impact 6.5-6: Stormwater runoff from the project, in combination with cumulative development in the CSS service area, could discharge urban pollutants to the Sacramento River, which could affect water quality. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-16.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Cumulative urban development in the CSS service area would result in the creation of increased impervious surfaces which could increase the types and amounts of pollutants in stormwater runoff. The primary sources of water pollution would include runoff from roadways, and parking lots, runoff from landscaping areas, industrial activities, non-stormwater connections to the drainage system, accidental spills and illegal dumping. Runoff from roadway and parking lots could contain high levels of oil, grease, and heavy metals. Runoff from landscaped areas could contain concentrations of nutrients from fertilizers as well as pesticides. (DEIR, p. 6.5-16.)

Urban runoff within of the City and County of Sacramento, City of Folsom, City of Citrus Heights, City of Elk Grove and the City of Galt are regulated under a joint NPDES permit (No. CAS082597), which was required under Phase 1 of the federal program. Phase 1 applied to discharges from large (population 250,000 or above) and medium (population 100,000 to 250,000) municipalities and certain industrial activities.Regulations pertaining to smaller jurisdictions, such as other cities in the Sacramento metropolitan area (e.g., Roseville, Rocklin) that also discharge urban runoff to the Sacramento River, required such jurisdictions to obtain permits under a Phase 2 program, which became effective in early 2003. The Phase 2 State Municipal Stormwater Permit required these smaller cities to develop, implement, and enforce a stormwater management program meeting the federal requirements for BMPs and other urban runoff water quality controls. The combined regional effect of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 programs is to reduce the types and amounts of urban pollutants discharged to waterways that drain to the Sacramento River. As discussed in Impact 6.5-2, the SMCS Project's contribution to post-construction water quality impacts associated with urban development would be minimal due to the developed nature of the SMCS Project area. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-16-6.5-17.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than cumulatively considerable, and thus, less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Impact 6.5:7: The project, in combination with cumulative development in the CSS service area, could discharge groundwater from dewatering to the sewer. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Excavations requiring dewatering and subsurface features of new buildings in the downtown/midtown Sacramento area served by the CSS system are expected to require some level of dewatering because of shallow groundwater conditions. It is possible that dewatering could occur simultaneously at more than one site. The volume of water

removed and the rate and frequency it would be discharged to the sewer would be site-specific. If controls such as the City's permit process for dewatering were not in place, the combined effect of simultaneous and/or consecutive discharges could overwhelm the CSS system and/or adversely affect water quality in the system. It could also cause localized shifts in groundwater patterns that could cause areas of degraded groundwater quality to shift. (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

The dewatering protocol established by the City and enforced at the City level would apply to the proposed project and other development where dewatering is needed in the CSS service area. City staff review of permit applications for dewatering would allow the City to determine the volumes and frequencies of discharges that would be allowed to the CSS from each project to ensure capacity is not exceeded and water quality violations do not occur. (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-17.)

Impact 6.5:8: The project, in combination with cumulative development in the CSS service area, would result in increased wastewater flows, which could affect Sacramento River water quality. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.5-18.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: Cumulative development in the City and County of Sacramento, in combination with the SMCS Project, would result in an increase in the amount of water conveyed to the CSS/CWTP and ultimately the SRWTP for treatment prior to discharge to the Sacramento River. Wastewater conveyed to the plants is expected to increase in volume and would continue to include various constituents that could affect influent and effluent water quality. Such discharges would occur regardless of whether the project is implemented. (DEIR, p. 6.5-18.)

The CSS improvements would only accommodate infill or redevelopment activities within the downtown area, and its service area will not be expanded to accommodate new development. As such, the CSS contribution to treated wastewater effluent discharges to the Sacramento River, including the proposed project, is not expected to contribute additional volumes or types of constituents that could adversely affect water quality. Because wastewater characteristics would be similar to existing conditions and flows are limited by CSS capacity, the cumulative impact is considered less than significant. The SMCS Project would contribute only a small percent of total CSS discharges (0.15 mgd), which is not considered substantial. (DEIR, p. 6.5-18.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.5-18.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is a less than significant cumulative impact without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.5-18.)

6. NOISE

Impact 6.6-1: Construction activities would intermittently generate noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinity. (Significant and Unavoidable). (DEIR, p. 6.6-22.)

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the Project's short-term significant noise impacts. No feasible mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain short-term significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: During construction of the proposed SMCS Project, noise levels would be produced by the operation of heavy-duty equipment and various other construction activities. This construction noise would affect surrounding uses, but would be temporary, lasting only until the project construction is completed. As discussed in the Environmental Setting, there are sensitive uses in the vicinity of the project area (primarily residences, schools, and existing hospital uses), some of which are just across the street from areas where development activity, including demolition activities, would occur. During construction, the nearby residences would be occupied and the nearby hospital would continue to accommodate patients. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

The Sacramento Municipal Code, Title 8 – Health and Safety, Chapter 8.68 – Noise Control, states that "it is unlawful for any person to make or continue or cause to be made or continued any loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood or which causes discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area". This chapter also sets "not-to-be-exceeded" exterior noise standards for residential property. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

Even though Chapter 8.68 sets general noise limits, the chapter also exempts certain activities from the provisions of the rest of the chapter. One of these activities is erection (including excavation), demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure, as long as the activity takes place between certain hours. These specified hours ensure that construction occurs only during daytime hours; thereby minimizing the chance that noise would be generated during the more "sensitive" hours when people may be trying to sleep. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

Because construction would occur during hours when buildings surrounding the different project site(s) are occupied, construction noise could impact these uses. As shown in Table 6.6-7 of the Draft EIR, jack-hammers could produce peak levels of up to 98 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet. Since noise from a point source usually attenuates at approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance, this would result in noise levels of about 101 dBA L_{eq} at 100 feet, and 95 dBA L_{eq} at 200 feet when this activity was ongoing. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

Even though the City of Sacramento Municipal Code exempts construction activities from

the noise standards specified elsewhere in the Municipal Code, this would do nothing to reduce the levels of construction noise experienced by occupants of nearby buildings, including Sutter General Hospital, the Buhler Building, other medical offices, and residents during the day. Construction activities such as the use of jackhammers and tractors would produce high levels of noise. Consequently construction noise, at least during the initial phases of demolition and grading, would create a ***short-term significant impact*** to surrounding uses. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

Theatre

Similar to the SMCS Project, the proposed Theatre would generate noise during construction. Senior housing exists across the street from the theatre site as well as other residential and office uses. Daytime construction noise would be a special issue at this senior housing, because residents are more likely to be at home during the day. Demolition and grading activities could generate particularly high levels of noise that could affect residents. (DEIR, p. 6.6-23.)

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.6-1, as modified by the Planning Commission to include a new measure 6.6-1(c), would reduce noise from construction activities. The short term noise impacts would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6.6-24.)

Significance After Mitigation: After mitigation, the impact is short-term significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6.6-24.)

Impact 6.6-2: Construction activities could result in ground borne vibration. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.6-24.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: In addition to noise, construction activity can also produce vibration. (DEIR, p. 6.6-24.)The closest buildings where people sleep would be over 50 feet away from all project site boundaries. As shown in Table 6.6-8 of the Draft EIR, this distance would ensure that VdB levels would not exceed the 80 VdB threshold at which sleep disturbance could occur. Consequently, even if impact equipment such as jackhammers were used during demolition or construction of the project, sleep would not be affected. Also, the Sacramento Municipal Code requires that construction activity take place only outside of recognized sleep hours, so sleep patterns of nearby residences would not likely be affected. (DEIR, p. 6.6-24.)

Construction-related vibration would not reach the 80 VdB threshold of significance and would not cause annoyance to occupants of these buildings. Also, no pile-driving would occur during construction, so no structural damage could occur to existing buildings. (DEIR, p. 6.6-25.)

Theatre
Construction of the Children's Theatre could create groundborne vibration, however

residential and other sensitive receptors are not located within 50 feet of the site of the proposed Theatre. Consequently, construction activities could not exceed the 80 VdB threshold and disturb sleep. Also, as discussed above, construction would be limited to daytime hours when sleep would not normally be disturbed. Construction of the Theatre would not require pile-driving, and so the structural integrity of nearby buildings would not be compromised. (DEIR, p. 6.6-24-6.6-25.)

Mitigation Measures: *None required.* (DEIR, p. 6.6-25.)

Significance After Mitigation: The impact is less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6.6-25.)

Impact 6.6-3: The SMCS Project could result in an increase in existing traffic noise levels at existing land uses in the project vicinity on the existing local roadway network. (Less than Significant). (DEIR, p. 6.6-25.)

Finding: Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation: The SMCS Project would increase ambient noise levels by increasing traffic on local roads. (DEIR, p. 6.6-25.) Table 6.6-9 of the Draft EIR shows both existing and Existing Plus Project noise levels for various roadways in the vicinity of the project area. As shown, some roadways nearby already generate traffic that creates noise levels over 60 dBA Ldn at receptors along these roads. In no case, however, would traffic noise levels currently below 60 dBA be increased to the extent that receptors along the roads would experience noise levels over 60 dBA Ldn as a result of the project. In general, traffic noise levels along roads in the vicinity of the project would not increase by more than 1.6 dBA, as shown in Table 6.6-9. This would not be a noticeable noise increase. (DEIR, p. 6.6-25 – 6.6-26.)

Theatre
The Theatre component would also generate traffic volumes, which would increase noise levels on local roadways adjacent to sensitive receptors. However, the Theatre would only generate traffic before and after performances, when theatre-goers are either going to or departing from a performance. This project-related traffic would occur intermittently, and due to the size of the proposed Theatre, the traffic is not anticipated to exceed noise levels over 60 dBA. Consequently, while the project could increase traffic noise at certain times, it would not generate an increase in traffic throughout the day that would result in a