Final EIR
For the Fulton Avenue Development Project

City of Sacramento

December 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....1-1

2.0 CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR 2-1

3.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING 3-1

4.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES 4-1

LETTER 1: Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

LETTER 2: California Department of Water Resources

LETTER 3: Donna Arteaga

LETTER 4: County Sanitation District 1

LETTER 5: California Department of Transportation

LETTER 6: Sacramento Trapshooting Club

LETTER 7: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

LETTER 8: State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN.....5-1

APPENDIX A UPDATED URBEMIS OUTPUT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Purpose of this Document

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) contains public comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Fulton Avenue Development Project (P06-012) received by the City of Sacramento during the public comment period held from October 6, 2006 through November 20, 2006. This FEIR includes written responses to each comment received on the Draft EIR. The responses correct, clarify, and amplify text in the Draft EIR, as appropriate. Also included are text changes made at the initiative of City staff. None of the changes made alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Background

The proposed project area is located in the City of Sacramento at the northeast corner of Business 80 (Capital City freeway) and the extension of Fulton Avenue. The project area consists of a parcel comprised of Del Paso Park, Haggin Oaks Golf Course and Softball Complex, and the Sacramento Trapshoot Club.

The Sacramento Trapshoot Club (STC) leased a 20-acre site from the City of Sacramento from 1915 to 2006. The use of lead shot and clay pigeons contaminated project site soils. The California Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC) requires the remediation of the contamination upon closure of the STC. Therefore, the project consists of two components: remediation of the contaminated soil, and development of the site with automotive-related uses.

The following work would be conducted for the Remediation: 1) removal and disposal of clay pigeon debris; 2) approximately two feet of contaminated soil from Parcel A and a small amount of soil from an area north of the 20-acre site would be consolidated onto Parcel B; 3) clean fill would be spread over the contaminated soils on Parcel B and overlain with an asphalt cap; and 4) clean fill would be imported to fill the void resulting from removal of the clay pigeons and contaminated soil and bring the site up to grade.

The development component includes an approximately 90,000 square foot automobile dealership on the northern portion of Parcel A. Another 90,000 square feet of commercial development is proposed for the southern portion for either another auto dealership or other automotive-related use. The remainder of Parcel A would be paved for vehicle parking and display.

The following development entitlements are necessary:

- General Plan Amendment to re-designate the project site from Parks/Recreation/Open Space to Heavy Commercial;
- Rezone of the project site from R-1 to Heavy Commercial (C-4);

- Approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide the approximately 456-acre parcel into two parcels of 10.8 acres and 6.7 acres, including a 2.5-acre right of way for the Fulton Avenue extension, as well as a 436.1-acre remainder lot;
- Establishment of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) with Schematic Plan and PUD Guidelines; and
- Three subdivision modifications for the extension of Fulton Avenue.

A Notice of Preparation of the Fulton Avenue Development Project Draft EIR was filed with the Office of Planning and Research and all responsible and trustee agencies and was circulated for public comments from December 29, 2005 to January 30, 2006.

Type of Document

This EIR is an informational document intended to disclose to the City of Sacramento and the public the environmental consequences of approving and implementing the remediation of the site and the Fulton Avenue Development Project (P06-012). The preparation of the Final EIR focuses on the responses to comments on the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency (City of Sacramento) must certify that that EIR adequately discloses the environmental effects of the project and has been completed in conformance with CEQA, and that the decision-making bodies independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR (which includes both Draft and Final) prior to taking action on the project. The Final EIR must also be considered by Responsible and Trustee Agencies, which are those public agencies that have discretionary approval authority over the project in addition to the Lead Agency.

This document contains the list of commenters, the comment letters, and responses to the environmental points raised in the comments, and other information added by the Lead Agency. The Draft EIR is hereby incorporated by reference.

Organization of the Document

For this FEIR, comments and responses are grouped by comment letter. Since the subject matter of one topic may overlap between letters, the reader must occasionally refer to more than one letter and response to review all of the information on a given subject. Responses to these comments are included in this document to provide additional information for use by the decision-makers.

The comments and responses that make up the FEIR, in conjunction with the Draft, as amended by the text changes, constitute the “EIR” that will be considered for certification by the City of Sacramento.

The Final EIR is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 - Introduction: This chapter includes a summary of the Project description and the process and requirements of a Final EIR.

Chapter 2 - Changes to the Draft EIR: This chapter lists the text changes to the Draft EIR.

Chapter 3 - List of Agencies and Persons Commenting: This chapter contains a list of all of the agencies or persons who submitted comments on the Draft EIR during the public review period, ordered by agency, organization and date.

Chapter 4 – Comment Letters and Responses: This chapter contains the comment letters received on the Draft EIR and the corresponding response to each comment. Each letter and each comment within a letter has been given a number. Responses are provided after the letter.

Chapter 5 – Mitigation Monitoring Plan: This chapter contains the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) to aid the City in its implementation and monitoring of measures adopted in the EIR.

Appendices: This section contains the appendices that support information contained in the Final EIR.

Public Participation and Review

The City of Sacramento notified all responsible and trustee agencies and interested groups, organizations, and individuals that the Draft EIR was available for review. The following lit of actions took place during the preparation, distribution, and review of the Draft EIR:

- A Notice of Preparation of the Fulton Avenue Development Project Draft EIR was filed with the Office of Planning and Research on December 29, 2005. A 30-day public review comment period for the NOP wasw established starting on December 29, 2005 and ending on January 30, 2006.

- A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the Office of Planning and Research on October 6, 2006. 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 October 6, 2006, and ended on November 20, 2006.

- 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 October 5, 2006. The NOA stated that the City of Sacramento had completed the Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Sacramento North Permit Center, 2101 Arena Blvd., Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95834. The NOA also indicated that the official forty-five (45) day public review period for the Draft EIR would end on November 20, 2006.

2.0 CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

Introduction

This chapter presents minor corrections and revisions made to the Draft EIR (DEIR) initiated by the public, staff, and/or consultants based on their on-going review. New text is indicated in double-underline and text to be deleted is reflected by ~~strikethrough~~.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

In response to a comment submitted by Donna Arteaga, the text on Page S-1, Paragraph 3 is revised as follows. In addition, the text is revised to reflect that the third parcel is a remainder lot, rather than a parcel.

In order to facilitate the future leasing of the site once remediation is complete, the proposed project includes a tentative parcel map to subdivide the project area. The 20-acre leasehold site is part of a larger 456-acre parcel. Three parcels are proposed. Parcel A would be approximately 6.7 acres, Parcel B would consist of approximately 10.8 acres, ~~and Parcel C would be~~ with a remainder lot of approximately 436 acres. Approximately 2.5 acres would be set aside as right of way for a public street. ~~Because~~

N~~n~~o improvements ~~or site disturbance is~~ are proposed on the remainder lot; however, approximately 2 acres of the lot, adjacent to the northern boundary of Parcel A, would be disturbed during the remediation activities. Sampling indicated that soils in this area are contaminated with lead. This DEIR analyzes the potential impacts to the remainder lot due to the remediation, construction, and operation of the proposed project on Parcels A and B as part of the analyses of the proposed project's offsite impacts. See the various analyses in the Initial Study and Chapters 1.1 through 1.6 and 5.1 of this DEIR. ~~Parcel C, this DEIR does not analyze any potential impacts to this parcel, with the exception of those associated with the tentative map.~~

2.0 Project Description

Since the time of the release of the DEIR, City staff has indicated more appropriate language for the Tentative Parcel Map Entitlement for the project. Therefore, staff has initiated the following change to the list of project entitlements on Page 2-10 of the DEIR:

- Approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide the approximately 456-acre parcel into ~~three~~two parcels of 10.8 acres~~,~~ and 6.7 acres, ~~and 436 acres,~~ including a 2.5-acre right of way for the Fulton Avenue extension, as well as a remainder lot of 436.1 acres (see Figure 2-9).

In addition, in response to a comment submitted by Jim Elliot, President of the Sacramento Trapshoot Club, Page 2-4 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

According to the Draft Final Response Plan (RFP), approximately 85,000 pounds of lead were deposited on the site each year (Page 3). Removal of the lead shot was performed by rototilling and removing the top six inches of soils, removing the lead shot for recycling, and returning the soil to the site. The removal of the shot occurred only in the areas with high amounts of lead on the surface. Records and contact with the STC indicate that the lead shot was periodically removed in 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001, ~~and~~ 2003, and 2005.

The comment letter submitted by Jim Elliot also resulted to the following change to the last full sentence on Page 2-8: There is ~~no natural gas service at the site~~ a ¾-inch steel natural gas line on the site, which will be addressed during the planning of the site. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Section 3.1 Air Quality

In response to the comment letter (See Comment Letter 5) submitted by Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the text under Impact 3.1-1R on page 3.1-8 of the DEIR is hereby revised as follows:

3.1-1R Remediation could generate emissions that would exceed City and SMAQMD thresholds.

Remediation of the project site would include demolition of existing structures, as well as grading, excavation, and soil moving activities, which would result in emission of criteria pollutants, which are regulated by the California Air Resources Board through the local air districts.

Tables 3.1-4 and 3.1-5 provide a summary of results for the construction-related impacts for each of the remediation project intervals as compared to the City of Sacramento and SMAQMD significance thresholds.

Table 3.1-4
Emissions Estimates Versus Significance Thresholds for Remediation Phase I

Pollutant	Daily Emission Comparison		
	Daily Threshold (pounds)	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	Daily Threshold Exceeded?
CO	None	~~22.48~~69.34	NA
NOx	**85**	**~~95.54~~131.24**	**Yes**
PM_{10}	None	~~25.25~~94.90	NA-
SO_2	None	0.16	NA
ROG	None	~~5.31~~10.90	NA

NA- Not applicable since no threshold exists.

Table 3.1-5

Emissions Estimates Versus Significance Thresholds for Remediation Phase II

Pollutant	Daily Emission Comparison		
	Daily Threshold (pounds)	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	Daily Threshold Exceeded?
CO	None	38.59	NA
NOx	**85**	74.27	No
PM_{10}	None	52.19	NA
SO_2	None	0.09	NA
ROG	None	6.10	NA

NA- Not applicable since no threshold exists

It should be noted that the SMAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County* states (p. 3-2) that if a project's NOx mass emissions from heavy-duty mobile sources is determined not potentially significant using the recommended methodologies (such as URBEMIS) for estimating emissions, then the Lead Agency may assume that exhaust emissions of other pollutants from operation of equipment and worker commute vehicles are also not significant. Therefore, because NOx emissions (74.27 lbs/day) generated by Phase II of the remediation would not exceed thresholds, the emissions would also not exceed City or SMAQMD thresholds for CO,PM_{10}, ROG, and SO2. However, the short term construction-related activities associated with Phase I of the remediation are estimated to generate ~~95.54~~131.24 lbs/day of NOx, which is ~~10.54~~46.24 lbs/day over the threshold. Therefore, the remediation would result in a **potentially significant** impact.

SMAQMD has provided specific mitigation for projects with construction emissions that exceed the threshold of significance for NOx. This mitigation includes demonstration of a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction, monitoring of off-road vehicle exhaust opacity, as well as submission of an off-road construction equipment inventory. However, this mitigation applies only to off-road construction equipment. The majority of NOx emissions resulting from the remediation would be generated by on-road diesel trucks. This is due to the large number of trucks (10) required to off-haul the clay pigeons, as well as the travel distance (118 miles per truck—round trip) to convey the pigeons to the disposal site in Manteca. ~~Therefore, this mitigation specified by SMAQMD for reduction of NOx emissions would not apply to the proposed remediation.~~ Implementation of this mitigation (see MM 3.1-2R) would therefore reduce the emissions generated by the off-road construction vehicles (39.98 lbs/day) by 20 percent (8.0 lbs/day). This reduces the overall NOx emissions for Phase I of the Remediation to 123.24 lbs/day.

However, SMAQMD has developed a mitigation program that assists in providing cleaner emissions technology within the region. A fee could be

paid to this program to offset the emissions over the significance threshold generated from the proposed remediation. The fee is calculated based on the amount of the mitigated construction emissions produced by the remediation less the District Threshold, multiplied by the number of days of construction multiplied by the standard District fee of $14,300/ton of NOx**.** Through compliance with this mitigation fee (see MM 3.1-1R), it is anticipated that the short-term impacts from NOx can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Therefore, a mitigation fee of ~~$3,542~~$12,850 is required, in combination with the 20 percent off-road construction vehicle mitigation, to reduce impacts resulting from the proposed remediation to a **less than significant** level. The mitigation fee is calculated as follows:

1. ~~95.54~~123.24 lbs/day - 85.00 lbs/day threshold= ~~10.54~~38.24 lbs/day over threshold
2. ~~10.54~~38.24 lbs/day x 47 days of clay pigeon removal = ~~495.38~~1,797.28 lbs
3. ~~495.38~~1,797.28 lbs ÷ 2,000 lbs/ton = ~~0.2477~~0.8986 tons
4. ~~0.2477~~0.8986 tons x $14,300/ton = **~~$3,542~~$12,850**

Mitigation Measures

MM 3.1-1R Prior to ground disturbance the City shall make payment to the SMAQMD the off-site air quality mitigation fee of ~~$3,542~~$12,850.

MM3.1-2R(a) The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the Development Services Department and AQMD, 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 NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction (acceptable options for reducing emissions include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available); and the City shall submit to AQMD 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 AQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.

MM3.1-2R(b) The City shall 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 the AQMD 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. The AQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other AQMD or state rules or regulations.

In addition, City staff identified a typographical error in the numbering of the Mitigation Measures. Therefore, staff has initiated the following change to the Mitigation number on page 3.1-15 of the DIER: MM3.1-2D shall now read MM 3.1-~~2~~3D.

Section 3.2 Biological Resources

In continuing discussions with Gibson Skordal, preparers of the Jurisdictional Delineation of the Report, it came to the attention of City staff that work within the on-site excavated channel may require a 1602 permit (Streambed Alteration Agreement) from the Department of Fish and Game. Consequently, City staff is hereby initiating revision to the last sentence in the last paragraph on Page 3.2-6, as follows:

> In addition, the areas that would be disturbed for installation of drainage, or other facilities would not occur within the Arcade Creek riparian corridor, and would not require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement from Department of Fish and Game. However, a Streambed Alteration Agreement (1602 Agreement) from the California Department of Fish and Game may be required for work in and along the banks of the excavated channel located in the eastern portion of the project area.

Section 3.6 Traffic and Circulation

The general format of Section 3.6 Traffic and Circulation is not consistent with the format of the DEIR. Therefore, City staff is hereby revising the page numbers, impact numbers, and mitigation numbers to be consistent with the rest of the DEIR.

Page number format throughout Section 3.6 shall be revised to include "3.6-" in front of the existing page number. For example, page "1" shall now read "3.6-1."

Impact number format throughout Section 3.6 shall be revised from the existing format, "Impact 5.13.x," to the following format: "3.6-xD" or "3.6-xR" ("D" or "R" indicates whether the impact results from Development or Remediation. The "x" will be replaced with number of the impact). For example, "Impact 5.13.1" shall now read "3.6-1D."

Mitigation measure number format throughout Section 3.6 shall be revised from the existing format, "Mitigation Measure 5.13.x," to the following format: "MM 3.6-xD" or "MM 3.6-xR" ("D" or "R" indicates whether the impact results from Development or Remediation. The "x" will be replaced with number of the impact). For example, "Mitigation Measure 5.13.1" shall now read "MM 3.6-1D."

City staff discovered that impact 5.13-6R, on Page 3.6-2 of the DEIR, concludes that the short-term traffic impacts associated with remediation would be less-than-significant, whereas mitigation measures are included to reduce the impact. Text should have been included in the DEIR that concluded that the impact was "potentially significant" and that the mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore staff is adding the following text to the impact discussion on page 3.6-2:

> The increased traffic resulting from removal of the day pigeon debris would be a short term potentially significant impact on Fulton Avenue and a portion of the Business 1-80 freeway.~~.~~ The construction-related effects on vehicular traffic would be localized and temporary (approximately 47 days) and, therefore, no long-term impacts would occur with the proposed project. <u>However, the short-term traffic impacts associated with the remediation of the site could result in a potentially significant impact.</u> Implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would ensure that the short-term impacts generated by the removal of the pigeon debris would be lessened to the maximum extent feasible by requiring traffic controls, on-site staging, and the regulation of the hours and route of traffic. It is anticipated that these measures would result in a less-than-significant traffic impacts to local and State roads.

This change resolves a minor omission in the DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

City staff identified a typographical error in MM 5.13-6R in the DEIR (which was revised above to read “MM 3.6-6R”). The error occurred on page 3.6-2. A phrase was misplaced in the beginning of the Mitigation Measure and is hereby deleted as follows: ~~Dust control measures shall be implemented during remediation activities, which may include one or more of the following:~~

3.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING

3.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING

The following list of commenting parties is listed in the order in which their comment was received:

1. Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, Robb Armstrong, Principal Engineering Technician, October 11, 2006.

2. California Department of Water Resources, Mike Mirmazaheri, Chief, Floodway Protection Section, October 12, 2006.

3. Donna Arteaga, November 3, 2006

4. County Sanitation District 1, Department of Water Quality, Wendy Haggard, P.E., Development Services, November 7, 2006.

5. California Department of Transportation, District 3 – Sacramento Office, Bruce De Terra, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning – South, November 21, 2006.

6. Sacramento Trapshooting Club, Jim Elliott, President, November 17, 2006.

7. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Mobile Source Division, Jeane Borkenhagen, Associate Air Quality Planner Analyst, November 20, 2006.

8. State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and research, Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, November 21, 2006.

4.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Letter 1

SRCSD

Wastewater Treatment

Technology in balance with nature

Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant
8521 Laguna Station Road
Elk Grove, CA 95758-9550
Tele: [916] 875-9000
Fax: [916] 875-9068
Website: www.srcsd.com

Board of Directors
Representing:

County of Sacramento
County of Yolo
City of Citrus Heights
City of Elk Grove
City of Folsom
City of Rancho Cordova
City of Sacramento
City of West Sacramento

Mary K. Snyder
District Engineer

Stan R. Dean
Plant Manager

Wendell H. Kido
District Manager

Marcia Maurer
Chief Financial Officer

RECEIVED
OCT 17 2006

October 11, 2006

Michael Parker
City of Sacramento – Development Services Department
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

Dear Mr. Parker:

Subject: **Notice of Availability – Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Fulton Avenue Development Project (P06-012)**

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) has reviewed the subject documents and has the following comments:

As stated in the NOP, the above-mentioned project site is located within the City of Sacramento at the northeast corner of Business 80 (Capital City Freeway) and the extension of Fulton Avenue. The site is compromised of Del Paso Park, which currently includes the Haggin Oaks Golf Course and Softball Complex and the Sacramento Trapshoot Club. 1-1

The City of Sacramento is responsible for providing local sewer service for the subject property. SRCSD is responsible for the conveyance of sewage from City collector pipelines to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP). SRCSD Impact fees may be required. Applicant should contact the City for sewer impact fee information. 1-2

Please be advised that the SRCSD McClellan Interceptor runs across the southern portion of the subject property but appears to be unaffected by the above-mentioned project. 1-3

County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) will respond via separate correspondence. 1-4

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter please feel free to contact me at (916) 876-6104.

Very truly yours,

Robb Armstrong,
Principal Engineering Technician

Printed on Recycled Paper

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

COMMENT LETTER 1: Robb Armstrong, SRCSD

Response to Comment 1-1:

The commenter provides a general description of the project location. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 1-2

The commenter indicates that the City of Sacramento is the local sewer provider for the proposed project, and that SRCSD is responsible for conveyance to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. The commenter notes that SRCSD impact fees may be required. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 1-3

The commenter indicates that the SRCSD McClellan Interceptor runs across the southern portion of the property, but would not be affected by the proposed project. The Interceptor is located to the west of the 20-acre project site and would not be affected by the proposed project. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 1-4

The commenter indicates that County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) will respond via separate correspondence. A comment letter was received by CSD-1 was received and is included in this FEIR as Letter 4.

This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Letter 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – THE RESOURCES AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 942360001
(916) 653-5791

RECEIVED
OCT 17 2006

October 12, 2006

Mike Parker
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95834

Fulton Avenue Development Project
State Clearinghouse (SCH) Number: 2005122130

The project corresponding to the subject SCH identification number has come to our attention. The limited project description suggests your project may be an encroachment on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. You may refer to the California Code of Regulations, Title 23 and Designated Floodway maps at http://recbd.ca.gov/. Please be advised that your county office also has copies of the Board's designated floodways for your review. If indeed your project encroaches on an adopted food control plan, you will need to obtain an encroachment permit from the Reclamation Board prior to initiating any activities. The attached Fact Sheet explains the permitting process. Please note that the permitting process may take as much as 45 to 60 days to process. Also note that a condition of the permit requires the securing all of the appropriate additional permits before initiating work. This information is provided so that you may plan accordingly. 2-1

If after careful evaluation, it is your assessment that your project is not within the authority of the Reclamation Board, you may disregard this notice. For further information, please contact Sam Brandon of my staff at (916) 574-0651.

Sincerely,

Mike Mirmazaheri, Chief
Floodway Protection Section

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

Encroachment Permits Fact Sheet

Basis for Authority

State law (Water Code Sections 8534, 8608, 8609, and 8710 – 8723) tasks the Reclamation Board with enforcing appropriate standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans. Regulations implementing these directives are found in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 1.

Area of Reclamation Board Jurisdiction

The adopted plan of flood control under the jurisdiction and authority of the Reclamation Board includes the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries and distributaries and the designated floodways.

Streams regulated by the Reclamation Board can be found in Title 23 Section 112. Information on designated floodways can be found on the Reclamation Board's website at http://recbd.ca.gov/designated_floodway/ and CCR Title 23 Sections 101 - 107.

Regulatory Process

The Reclamation Board ensures the integrity of the flood control system through a permit process (Water Code Section 8710). A permit must be obtained prior to initiating any activity, including excavation and construction, removal or planting of landscaping within floodways, levees, and 10 feet landward of the landside levee toes. Additionally, activities located outside of the adopted plan of flood control but which may foreseeable interfere with the functioning or operation of the plan of flood control is also subject to a permit of the Reclamation Board.

Details regarding the permitting process and the regulations can be found on the Reclamation Board's website at http://recbd.ca.gov/ under "Frequently Asked Questions" and "Regulations," respectively. The application form and the accompanying environmental questionnaire can be found on the Reclamation Board's website at http://recbd.ca.gov/forms.cfm.

Application Review Process

Applications when deemed complete will undergo technical and environmental review by Reclamation Board and/or Department of Water Resources staff.

Technical Review

A technical review is conducted of the application to ensure consistency with the regulatory standards designed to ensure the function and structural integrity of the adopted plan of flood control for the protection of public welfare and safety. Standards and permitted uses of designated floodways are found in CCR Title 23 Sections 107 and Article 8 (Sections 111 to 137). The permit contains 12 standard conditions and additional special conditions may be placed on the permit as the situation warrants. Special conditions, for example, may include mitigation for the hydraulic impacts of the project by reducing or eliminating the additional flood risk to third parties that may caused by the project.

Additional information may be requested in support of the technical review of

your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include but not limited to geotechnical exploration, soil testing, hydraulic or sediment transport studies, and other analyses may be required at any time prior to a determination on the application.

Environmental Review

A determination on an encroachment application is a discretionary action by the Reclamation Board and its staff and subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 et seq.). Additional environmental considerations are placed on the issuance of the encroachment permit by Water Code Section 8608 and the corresponding implementing regulations (California Code of Regulations – CCR Title 23 Sections 10 and 16).

In most cases, the Reclamation Board will be assuming the role of a "responsible agency" within the meaning of CEQA. In these situations, the application must include a certified CEQA document by the "lead agency" [CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(2)]. We emphasize that such a document must include within its project description and environmental assessment of the activities for which are being considered under the permit.

Encroachment applications will also undergo a review by an interagency Environmental Review Committee (ERC) pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 10. Review of your application will be facilitated by providing as much additional environmental information as pertinent and available to the applicant at the time of submission of the encroachment application.

These additional documentations may include the following documentation:

- California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Notification (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/1600/),
- Clean Water Act Section 404 applications, and Rivers and Harbors Section 10 application (US Army Corp of Engineers),
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and
- corresponding determinations by the respective regulatory agencies to the aforementioned applications, including Biological Opinions, if available at the time of submission of your application.

The submission of this information, if pertinent to your application, will expedite review and prevent overlapping requirements. This information should be made available as a supplement to your application as it becomes available. Transmittal information should reference the application number provided by the Reclamation Board.

In some limited situations, such as for minor projects, there may be no other agency with approval authority over the project, other than the encroachment permit by Reclamation Board. In these limited instances, the Reclamation Board

may choose to serve as the "lead agency" within the meaning of CEQA and in most cases the projects are of such a nature that a categorical or statutory exemption will apply. The Reclamation Board cannot invest staff resources to prepare complex environmental documentation.

Additional information may be requested in support of the environmental review of your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include biological surveys or other environmental surveys and may be required at anytime prior to a determination on the application.

COMMENT LETTER 2: Mike Mirmazaheri, Department of Water Resources

Response to Comment 2-1:

The commenter indicates that the project may encroach on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. The commenter then provides information for determining whether the project would encroach on the State Plan, and includes an attachment that provides encroachment permit information. The commenter concludes by stating that if it is determined that the project is not located within the authority of the Reclamation Board, then the notice may be disregarded.

Therefore, this comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Letter 3

RECEIVED
NOV - 8 2006

November 3, 2006

Mr. Michael Parker
Environmental Planner
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Blvd., Suite 200
Sacramento, Ca 95834

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)
Fulton Avenue Development Project

Dear Mr. Parker:

This is in response to the above named DEIR regarding the proposal to lease approximately 20 acres currently designated as parkland to heavy commercial use. Specifically, the plan is to develop auto related uses and at least one car dealership at the former Sacramento Trapshoot Club adjacent to the Haggin Oaks Golf Course. This proposal to convert public parkland to commercial use should not be approved. The land should remain for public park and recreation use and not be converted to non-recreational use. 3-1

Comments to the DEIR:

1. Summary, page S-1, paragraph 3; strike to the last sentence; "Because no improvements or site disturbance is proposed on Parcel C (436 acres of Haggin Oaks Golf Course), this DEIR does not analyze any potential impacts to this parcel, with the exception of those associated with the tentative map." The DEIR should address the potential impacts to Parcel C since the proposed heavy commercial development would have a direct impact on the Haggin Oaks Golf Course. As a golfer and a user of Haggin Oaks Golf Course, commercial development would be intrusive. 3-2
2. The DEIR fails to include the impacts to recreation. This comment was previously submitted to Economic Development but was not included in the Initial Study. Recreation would most definitely be impacted and should be thoroughly reviewed in the Initial Study. 3-3
3. Section 3.5, Noise, page 3.5 -1 under "Development", the DEIR should address the potential impacts of auto related uses and one or more commercial car dealerships during their operational use, not only during the construction phase. Specifically, the public address systems (PA) noise levels would be loud and intrusive, and not acceptable adjacent to the golf course. The PA systems would be highly invasive to the golfing public and should not be allowed. This comment was previously submitted to Economic Development and was not included in the DEIR. Currently, multiple car dealerships are located on the south side of Business 80 across from the golf course and the PA systems are very loud. The proposal of one or more auto related uses should be analyzed for compatibility with the golfing venue. With McClellan AFB closing a few 3-4

1

years ago, it was a relief not to be constantly being bombarded with loud, low flying airplanes, and now a more intrusive activity is being proposed. 3-4 cont'd

4. Section 4.0, Alternatives, page 40.0-2, Golf Course Related Uses; the DEIR should reconsider the site for additional golf course related activities. The approximately 20 acre site is of appropriate size and acreage to accommodate a 9-hole executive golf course. This would be similar to the Bing Maloney 9-Hole Executive Course. A 9-hole executive course would serve customers currently not being served such as the First Tee Junior Golfers, beginning golfers (not comfortable playing on a championship course), and senior golfers. A 9-hole executive course would attract new users and generate revenue. Golf is a fee-generated activity and this would also preserve the land for recreation. 3-5
5. Section, 4.0, Alternatives, page 4.0-2, the General Plan Amendment process to rezone the site from Parks/Recreation/Open Space to commercial use should be open to public comment and full disclosure. In addition, the General Plan Amendment process should be a separate review and approval process from the DEIR. 3-6

- Action: Develop a 9-hole executive golf course.
- Result: Preserve the site for park and recreation use. Provide a golf course for customers not currently being served – junior golfers, beginners, seniors unable to walk a championship course. Provide compatible use to the existing site. Operation and maintenance resources currently exist at the Haggin Oaks Golf Course. No need to amend the General Plan. 3-7

- Action: Allow the Sacramento Trapshoot Club to remain on the site and continue the lease.
- Result: The recreation venue should remain and serve users. Continue to remediate the contamination and coordinate the cleanup with the club. 3-8

- Action: Change the land use from recreation to heavy commercial.
- Result: There will be loss of recreational opportunity; noise intrusion; aesthetic intrusion; use not compatible with the golf course; loss of golf participants due to commercial invasiveness. Golfers will go to other courses for a better golfing experience; loss of fees. Public will mistrust the City if parks are not preserve for future generations. 3-9

This proposal to convert parkland to heavy commercial use has been reviewed with the following groups. All verbally support the preservation of land for parks and recreation. 3-10

1. First Tee
2. Haggin Oaks Women's Club
3. Sierra Club, Mother Lode Chapter
4. Sacramento Valley Conservancy
5. Various Sacramento Area Golfers

The City has a moral obligation to preserve and protect parkland for future generations and provide for the best interest of the public. The commercial development should not be located on parkland but on existing commercial land south of Business 80. I strongly urge the City to preserve the approximately 20 acres for park and recreational use, and strongly request the City to develop a comparable use adjacent to Haggin Oaks Golf Course. The best scenario would be to develop a 9-hole executive golf course. 3-11

If you have any questions, you may contact me at the 359-0656.

Sincerely,

Donna Arteaga

Donna Arteaga
Retired, State Parks and Recreation
Grants Administration

3218 Green Crest Court
Sacramento, Ca 95821

Cc: Mayor, Heather Fargo
Janet Baker, Park Operations Manager
Doug Parker, Golf Manager

COMMENT LETTER 3: Donna Arteaga, Golf Course User

Response to Comment 3-1:

The commenter provides a general description of the project and indicates that commercial uses should not be approved for location on the project site and that the project site should be use for public park and recreation.

The commenter presents an opinion related to the preferred land use for the site. This comment does not raise specific issues regarding the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-2

The commenter is correct that the DEIR should address the potential impacts to the remainder parcel (Parcel C). The DEIR did address these potential impacts and the text is revised to reflect this fact. Therefore, in response to the comment, the text on Page S-1, Paragraph 3 is revised as follows. In addition, the text is revised to reflect that the third parcel is a remainder lot, rather than a parcel.

In order to facilitate the future leasing of the site once remediation is complete, the proposed project includes a tentative parcel map to subdivide the project area. The 20-acre leasehold site is part of a larger 456-acre parcel. Three parcels are proposed. Parcel A would be approximately 6.7 acres, Parcel B would consist of approximately 10.8 acres, ~~and Parcel C would be~~ with a remainder lot of approximately 436 acres. Approximately 2.5 acres would be set aside as right of way for a public street. ~~Because~~

N~~n~~o improvements ~~or site disturbance is~~ are proposed on the remainder lot; however, approximately 2 acres of the lot, adjacent to the northern boundary of Parcel A, would be disturbed during the remediation activities. Sampling indicated that soils in this area are contaminated with lead. This DEIR analyzes the potential impacts to the remainder lot due to the remediation, construction, and operation of the proposed project on Parcels A and B as part of the analyses of the proposed project's offsite impacts. See the various analyses in the Initial Study and Chapters 1.1 through 1.6 and 5.1 of this DEIR. ~~Parcel C, this DEIR does not analyze any potential impacts to this parcel, with the exception of those associated with the tentative map.~~

Response to Comment 3-3

The commenter indicates that the DEIR does not include impacts to recreation and refers to a comment sent to Economic Development, which the commenter indicates was not included in the Initial Study. During the NOP comment period a comment form, prepared by Donna Arteaga, was received on January 27, 2006. This comment on the NOP was included within Appendix A of the DEIR. Regarding recreation, this NOP comment states" the EIR for the Rapton Honda project should include impacts to recreation." The Initial Study, included as

Appendix B of the DEIR, discusses impacts related to recreation. The Initial Study concludes that all impacts would be less-than-significant. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue DEIR (Initial Study).

Response to Comment 3-4

The commenter indicates that her comment was submitted to Economic Development, but was not included in the Initial Study. During the NOP comment period, a comment form prepared by Donna Arteaga was received on January 27, 2006. This comment on the NOP was included within Appendix A of the DEIR.

In addition, the commenter also expresses concern that Section 3.5 of the DEIR should address operational noise impacts associated with the proposed automotive-related uses. It should be noted that the Initial Study (p. 34) analyzed impacts associated with operation of the auto dealership, including noise generated by a PA system. The Initial Study states that "Noise generated by automotive service centers is predominantly associated with the use of small hand-held pneumatic tools….Other equipment operations such as lifts, compressed air nozzles, air compressors, tire changers, and intercoms (PA system) would generate a lesser degree of noise impact." The Initial Study (p. 34) further indicates that "predicted maximum noise levels at the hotels and the Haggin Oaks Golf Course would be approximately 41 dBA….Predicted operational noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses would, therefore, not be anticipated to exceed the applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources adopted by the City and County of Sacramento."

Stationary noise sources are subject to the requirements of the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance. Although the Noise Ordinance does not state specific noise requirements for noise exposure to recreational facilities, such as golf courses, the Ordinance indicates that for residential properties, the daytime noise limit is 55 dBA and the nighttime noise limit is 50 dBA. This assumes cumulative noise duration for 30 minutes per hour. In addition, the noise ordinance indicates that for noise consisting of speech or music, the threshold is reduced by 5 dBA. This would result in a daytime noise limit of 50 dBA and a nighttime noise limit of 45 dBA. Therefore, the 41 dBA generated by the operation of the project (including the PA system) would not exceed Noise Ordinance requirements for residential properties.

Therefore, noise generated by operation of the proposed automotive-related uses was adequately analyzed in the Initial Study, included as Appendix B of the DEIR. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR (Initial Study).

Response to Comment 3-5

The commenter recommends that a Golf Course Alternative be reconsidered in the DEIR. The commenter states "the approximately 20 acre site is of appropriate size and acreage to accommodate a 9-hole executive golf course." In addition, the commenter indicates that a 9-hole golf course would attract new users and generate revenue.

However, Parcel B, which consists of approximately 6.7 acres would be capped with asphalt as part of the required remediation for the site. Consequently, because a golf course use could only occur on the uncapped portion of the site (approximately 10.8 acres), the DEIR is correct in stating (p. 4.0-2) that the project site was not considered large enough to accommodate an additional 9-hole course or a driving range. Therefore, because the site is not considered large enough for a golf course, the DEIR is correct in eliminating this Alternative. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-6

The commenter indicates that the General Plan Amendment process should be open to public comment and full disclosure and that this process should be separate from the DEIR process. The General Plan Amendment entitlement, as well as the entitlement for certification of the EIR, will both be subject to public hearing. The potential impacts due to the proposed amendment to the General Plan were analyzed in the DEIR, in addition to the potential impacts due to the construction and operation of the project. Therefore, this process includes full disclosure, as well as public comment. The EIR for the Fulton Avenue Development will have to be certified before the requested amendment to the General Plan can be approved. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-7

See Response to Comment 3-5.

Response to Comment 3-8

The commenter describes the results of allowing the Sacramento Trapshoot Club to remain on the site. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-9

The commenter describes the results of changing the land use of the site from recreation to heavy commercial. Issues raised by the commenter with the proposed change in land use include: loss of recreational opportunity; noise intrusion; aesthetic intrusion; use not compatible with a golf course; and loss of golf participants due to commercial invasiveness.

Of the five issues raise in this comment, four are considered environmental issues under CEQA. Loss of golf participants due to commercial invasiveness is not considered an environmental issue under CEQA. The other four issues are analyzed in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR. The DEIR's conclusions related to the other four issues are described below:

- Loss of recreational opportunity. Impacts to recreation were analyzed in the Initial Study (p. 41), included as Appendix B of the DEIR. Impacts were concluded to be less-than-significant.
- Noise Intrusion. Impacts associated with noise were analyzed in the Initial Study (p. 32), included as Appendix B. Operational impacts were not considered substantial. However short-term construction noise was further analyzed in Section 3.5 of the DEIR. This section of the DEIR concludes that noise generated from trenchless tunneling activities could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive receptors across Business I-80.
- Aesthetic Intrusion: Impacts associated with aesthetics were analyzed in the Initial Study (p. 6), included as Appendix B of the DEIR. Impacts were concluded to be less-than-significant.
- Use Not Compatible with a Golf Course: Impacts associated with conversion of the land use designation from Parks/Recreation/Open Space to Heavy Commercial was analyzed in the Initial Study (p. 29), included as Appendix B of the DEIR. Impacts were concluded to be less-than-significant.

The above impacts associated with operation of a commercial use on the site were analyzed and considered to be less-than-significant. Therefore, this comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-10

The commenter indicates a list of parties who have reviewed the project and have verbally supported the preservation of land for parks and recreation. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 3-11

The commenter concludes the letter indicating that the City has a moral obligation to preserve parkland and that commercial development should not be located on the site. The commenter urges City leaders to develop a use comparable with the adjacent golf course. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Letter 4

CSD-1
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT 1
Wastewater Collection For a Growing Sacramento

10545 Armstrong Avenue
Mather
California
95655
Tele: [916] 876-6000
Fax: [916] 876-6160
www.csd-1.com

Board of Directors
Representing:
County of Sacramento
City of Citrus Heights
City of Elk Grove
City of Folsom
City of Rancho Cordova
City of Sacramento

Mary K. Snyder
District Engineer
Christoph Dobson
Acting Collection Systems Manager
Wendell H. Kido
District Manager
Marcia Maurer
Chief Financial Officer

RECEIVED
NOV 13 2006

November 7, 2006
E225.000

Michael Parker
City of Sacramento
Development Services Department
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

Subject: Notice of Availability – Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Fulton Avenue Development Project
APN: 254-0011-027
Control No. P06-012

Dear Mr. Parker:

County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) reviewed the subject documents and has the following comments. Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) reviewed the subject documents and commented in a separate letter. 4-1

The subject property is outside the boundaries of CSD-1 but within the Urban Service Boundary and SRCSD shown on the Sacramento County General Plan. Sacramento City Utilities Department approval will be required for sewage service.

The subject project will not significantly impact CSD-1 Facilities. Additional CSD-1 comments and conditions of approval are not needed at this time. 4-2

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call Stephen Moore at (916) 876-6296 or myself at (916) 876-6094.

Sincerely,

For Wendy Haggard, P.E.
Department of Water Quality
Development Services

WH/CJ: cc

cc: Melenie Davis
Amber Schalansky

parker110706.ltr.doc

COMMENT LETTER 4: Wendy Haggard, CSD-1

Response to Comment 4-1:

The commenter indicates that SRCSD has provided separate comments. A comment letter was received by SRCSD and is included in this FEIR as Letter 1.

This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 4-2

The commenter indicates that the proposed project is outside of the CSD-1 service boundaries (but within SRCSD and Urban Service boundaries) and that the project would not affect CSD-1 facilities. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Letter 5

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3 – SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE
VENTURE OAKS – MS 15
P.O. BOX 942874
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001
PHONE (916) 274-0614
FAX (916) 274-0648
TTY (530) 741-4509

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

November 21, 2006

06SAC0205
03-SAC-51 PM 6.788
Fulton Avenue Development Project (P06-012)
Draft Environmental Impact Report
SCH# 2005122130

Mr. Mike Parker
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

Dear Mr. Parker:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Fulton Avenue Development Project (former Mel Rapton Honda project, Del Paso Park project). The project proposes a 90,000 square foot (sq. ft.) automobile dealership, and another 90,000 sq. ft. automobile dealership or auto-related use. The development is immediately adjacent to the State Route 51 (Business 80)/Fulton Avenue interchange. Our comments are as follows: 5-1

- Per mitigation measure 5.13.4, Caltrans looks forward to working with the applicant to install a traffic signal at the Business 80 westbound ramps at Fulton Avenue.

If you have any questions about these comments please contact Alyssa Begley at (916) 274-0635.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Begley for

BRUCE DE TERRA, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—South

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

COMMENT LETTER 5: Bruce DeTerra, Caltrans

Response to Comment 5-1:

The commenter indicates that Caltrans appreciates the opportunity to review the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and provides a brief project description. The commenter indicates that Caltrans looks forward to working with the developer on implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.13.4, which includes installation of a traffic signal at the Business 80 westbound ramps at Fulton Avenue. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Letter 6

SACRAMENTO TRAPSHOOTING CLUB
P. O. Box 214357
Sacramento, CA 95821
PH. (916) 806-3982

November 17, 2006

RECEIVED
NOV 20 2006

City of Sacramento
Environmental Planning Services
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

Attn: Michael Parker

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report
Fulton Avenue Development Project
SCH# 2005122130

Dear Mr. Parker

I am writing this letter in behalf of the Sacramento Trapshooting Club and its members and also the citizens of the City and County of Sacramento. Following is a list of comments relating to the Draft Environmental Impact Report and other related documents.

To clarify certain comments it is our findings:

1. The Haggin Oaks property consisted of 828 Acres and was purchased by the City of Sacramento in 1914. According to the City archives the original intended use of the Property was to establish a park and/or park and recreational properties. 6-1

2. The Sacramento Trapshooting Club was given the use of 28+ Acres for the establishment of a "Public" shooting range in 1926. The property has been reduced in size by the building of Highway 80 to the South and East and construction of the Haggin Golf complex to the West. This property has been operated, as directed by the City of Sacramento to date. To our findings there was no formal written agreements until the early 1980's when the first operating agreement was tendered. There have been substantial periods after that date when no written agreements were in place. But the facility has always been operated as directed by the City of Sacramento. 6-2

Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Jurisdictional Delineation Report prepared for the City of Sacramento by Gibson & Skordal

1. a. According to our consultant Visger and Associated, Inc. this report is incomplete. There are several environmental constraints which may need to be addressed. (A copy of this report will be furnished by your request. 6-3
   b. We cannot find where this Delineation Report has ever been presented to the Sacramento City Council. And as such never been certified. 6-4
   c. We do not find completed studies by the State of California Department of Fish and Game and/or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 6-5
   d. We do not find any record of the application for the necessary 404 permits, or the issuance of said permit, by the U. S. Corp of Engineers. 6-6

Scope of the EIR

1. Department of Water Resources, Floodway Protection Section. It is our understanding the Drainage system will be redesigned. We do not find the application and/or issuance of the necessary permits. 6-7

2. Department of Transportation, District 3. We do not find application for and/or a completed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) 6-8

3. Concerned Citizen. This property as indicated above has been used for recreational uses for Over 80 years. What effect will the operation of an automobile dealership have in relation surrounding uses? 6-9

Project Components

1. Lead shot was removed in 2005 and records forwarded to the City of Sacramento. A total of approx. 160,000 lbs. was removed. 6-10

2. Phase 1 - The remediation plan calls for the removal and disposal of appr. 14,000 cubic yards of clay pigeon debris at the Forward Landfill, a Class 1 through 111 landfill, located in Manteca, California. In the study performed by Engeo Inc., dated July 11, 2005, made for Baseline environmental Consulting, "the clay pigeon debris may be used as engineered fill provided it is mixed with native soil to provide a well graded mixture for compaction". "Their preliminary lab test data indicate that the clay pigeon mixed at ratios of 3:1 and 4:1 with native soil show minimal shrink/swell potential and appear to have relatively good pavement sub grade properties. There are further details contained in this report. It appears the removal of the target debris from the site is far move expense than the use of this debris as partial fill. (The Response Plan indicates a total of up to 5 feet of fill will be required). 6-11

3. It might be noted the existing asphalt parking lot on the property is to be removed. The asphalt contains much the same components as contained in the clay targets, namely the Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs). The debris from this should and/or could be handled in the same manner as the clay target debris. 6-12

4. The dates for the anticipated start of remediation in February 2007 would appear to be unrealistic. Soils must be totally dry and vegetation removed in order to mine the existing lead. Also it would appear all necessary permits and approvals be in place before an work is started. 6-13

Sewer.

1. It should be noted there is an existing Septic System on the site. From maps we have seen Septic tank and Leach lines may be under the proposed construction of new buildings. Therefore this system may need to be removed. 6-14

Storm Drainage

1. There is an existing storm drain system in the parking lot. Drainage lines runs westerly to the golf complex. It would appear this line should be removed prior to any building for the automobile dealership is started. 6-15

Schedule

1. No construction should be considered until all necessary permits i.e.: California Department of Fish and Game, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Water Resources and U. S. Corp of Engineers. 6-16

Environmental Settings

1. The DEIR notes there is no natural gas service to the site. That is incorrect there is natural gas provided by P G & E. A more comprehensive study should point out where the gas lines are to eliminate the possibility of a rupture and possible accident. 6-17

2. The site parking, building and grass areas have not been changed since the original construction beginning in 1926. Only about 11 acres of the property has been used for clay target and lead shot fall. 6-18

There are other issues that may or may not be pertinent to the development of this property. A careful analysis of the "Site Assessment and Preliminary Option Report" prepared by Richard K. "Dick" Peddicord, Ph.D., copies supplied to the City of Sacramento, should be taken into account. Dr. Peddicord is one of the foremost experts in this field. His credentials have also been provided to the City of Sacramento. 6-19

Thank you for your concerns.

Respectfully

Jim Elliott
President, Sacramento Trapshooting Club

COMMENT LETTER 6: Jim Eliot, President, Sacramento Trapshoot Club

Response to Comment 6-1:

The commenter indicates that the original Haggin Oaks property consisted of 828 acres. The commenter also mentions that City archives indicate the original intended use of the property was for parks/recreational purposes. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-2

The commenter describes the history of the operating agreement of the Sacramento Trapshoot Club with the City of Sacramento. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 6-3

The commenter indicates that the Jurisdictional Delineation Report, prepared by Gibson & Skordal is incomplete. The Jurisdictional Delineation Report will be submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers as part of the Nationwide Permit application process. If the Delineation does not meet US Army Corps of Engineers requirements then the project will not move forward until the US Army Corps of Engineers accepts the Delineation. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-4

The commenter indicates that the Jurisdictional Delineation Report has not been presented to, or certified, by City Council. However, the City Council does not have discretionary approval over a Jurisdictional Delineation. A Jurisdictional Delineation must be certified by the US Army Corps of Engineers. In addition, a Corps-certified Delineation is not required for the CEQA review process. The delineation will be submitted to the Corps for verification concurrently with the request for Nationwide Permit authorization. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-5

The commenter indicates that no studies prepared by US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or Department of Fish and Game (DFG) are included in the Jurisdictional Delineation Report.

No studies are required by the USFWS or DFG. Both DFG and the US Fish and Wildlife Service were provided a copy of the DEIR as part of the CEQA process. No comments were received from DFG or USFWS. As part of the US Army Corps of Engineers permit process, the City would undergo Section 7 consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service for impacts to vernal pool invertebrate habitat, which has

been fully discussed in the DEIR with appropriate mitigation required (p. 3.2-10). In addition, the City would apply for a 1602 permit from DFG, prior to work within the excavated channel located on the eastern portion of the project area.

This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-6

The commenter indicates there is no record of application for permits from the US Army Corps of Engineers within the Jurisdictional Delineation Report. The application has not yet been submitted to the Corps. In order for the Corps to issue a permit, the Regional Water Quality Control Board must first provide Section 401 certification for the project. In order to provide 401 certification, the Board must be provided a certified CEQA document. Therefore, permits cannot be obtained by the City prior to certification of the EIR. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-7

The commenter indicates that there is no record of permits for redesign of the drainage system. However, permits are not required at the pre-approval stage of the project. The project would acquire all necessary permits prior to construction. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-8

The commenter indicates that a Traffic Impact Study was not available. However, a Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Dowling Associates specifically for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study is included in the DEIR as Section 3.6. In addition, the DEIR was provided to Caltrans as part of the CEQA process. Caltrans submitted a comment letter (see Comment Letter 5), which did not raise any issues with the adequacy of the traffic study or the DEIR. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-9

The commenter raises a question regarding the effects of an automobile dealership on surrounding land uses. The Initial Study includes a Land Use section (p. 28), which discusses compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding land uses. The Initial Study concludes that land use impacts associated with the proposed project would be less-than-significant. In addition, the EIR addresses the potential impacts of the construction and operation of automotive uses on the adjacent recreational uses. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-10

The commenter indicates that 160,000 pounds of lead shot were removed in 2005 and records were submitted to the City. Therefore, the second paragraph on Page 2-4 of the DEIR is revised to reflect removal in 2005.

According to the Draft Final Response Plan (RFP), approximately 85,000 pounds of lead were deposited on the site each year (Page 3). Removal of the lead shot was performed by rototilling and removing the top six inches of soils, removing the lead shot for recycling, and returning the soil to the site. The removal of the shot occurred only in the areas with high amounts of lead on the surface. Records and contact with the STC indicate that the lead shot was periodically removed in 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001, ~~and~~ 2003, and 2005.

This revision to the text of the DEIR does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR. The County of Sacramento has indicated that the project site requires remediation, due, in part, to elevated lead concentrations within the project site soils, apart from the lead shot, itself.

Response to Comment 6-11

The commenter describes the possibility and cost-effectiveness of using clay pigeons as fill, rather than importing clean fill. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 6-12

The commenter indicates that the asphalt in the parking lot is comprised of many of the same components as the clay pigeons; consequently, the debris from the parking lot should be handled in a similar way. As indicated in the DEIR (p. 3.4-3) the clay pigeon material was sampled, analyzed, and characterized and classified as a non-hazardous waste. In addition, the DEIR (p. 3.4-7) includes mitigation measures to reduce hazardous materials-related impacts associated with the remediation. Demolition of on-site structures, including removal of existing asphalt, is included in the remediation component of the proposed project; therefore, the mitigation measures would apply. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-13

The commenter describes the anticipated start date for remediation (February 2007) as unrealistic due to condition of the soil and scheduling for required permits. Removal of lead shot from the site is assumed to occur prior to remediation and was not analyzed as part of the project's impacts. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-14

The commenter describes an existing septic tank on the project site, which may currently be located within the proposed building footprint. The commenter indicates that the septic system may need to be removed.

The commenter is correct in indicating that the existing septic system would require removal. Page 55 of the Initial Study, included as Appendix B of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR, indicates that, as part of the proposed remediation, the existing septic tank that served the former STC would be abandoned. Therefore, because the septic tank would be abandoned as part of the remediation, it would not affect the placement of proposed structures. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-15

The commenter describes an existing storm drainage system within the parking lot and indicates that this system should be removed prior to construction of buildings. Remediation of the project site includes demolition of existing structures, including removal of the existing parking lot and any associated infrastructure below the parking lot. Therefore, as the commenter indicated, any drainage system currently located in the parking lot would be removed prior to construction of buildings. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-16

The commenter indicates that no construction should be considered until all necessary permits are acquired (i.e. DFG, USFWS, Department of Water Resources, and the Corps).

The USFWS would not issue a permit for the project; however, the City would undergo Section 7 consultation with the USFWS as part of the permit process with the Corps. In addition, the Department of Water Resources would not issue a permit; however the Regional Water Quality Control Board would be required to provide Section 401 certification for the proposed project as part of the permit process with the Corps. A 1602 permit would be required from DFG prior to any construction within the excavated channel located on the eastern portion of the site. It is assumed that the remediation and development of the project would comply with all provisions of the permits issued and would not conduct any activity requiring a permit without first obtaining the permit. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 6-17

The commenter notes that the DEIR is incorrect in stating that there is no natural gas service to the project site. The commenter is correct in noting that the DEIR misstated that there is no natural gas service to the project site. Therefore, the last full sentence on Page 2-8 is hereby revised as follows: There is ~~no natural gas service at the site~~ a ¾-inch steel natural gas line on the site, which will be addressed during the planning of the site. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-18

The commenter indicates that the site parking, building, and grass areas have not changed since the original construction beginning in 1926. The commenter states that only 11 acres of the site has been used for clay pigeon and lead shot fall. The Response Plan, prepared for the proposed project by Baseline Inc. (included in the DEIR as Appendix F), identified areas of contamination based on soil sampling and laboratory analysis, regardless of the area that had previously been used for clay pigeon and lead shot fall.

This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-19

The commenter refers generally to other issues that “may or may not be pertinent to development of this property” and recommends detailed review of a document prepared by “Richard K. Petticord, Ph.D.” This document has been reviewed by City staff and does not raise issues with the DEIR. This comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures in the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR.

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Larry Greene
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER

November 27, 2006

Mr. Mike Parker
Development Services Department
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Blvd, suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

SUBJECT: Draft EIR for the Fulton Avenue Development Project
SMAQMD # SAC20060001066B ***CORRECTION to 10/27/06 letter***

Dear Mr. Parker:

This letter represents a correction to the District comment letter of November 20, 2006. A correction to that letter is in order subsequent to our further review of the environmental document and discussions with you. The corrections to the former letter are identified in *italics*. 7-1

Thank you for providing the project listed above to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (District). Staff comments follow.

The DEIR states that the project will be constructed in phases: Remediation Phase I, Remediation Phase II and Building Construction, including asphalt. As the result of an air quality analysis, Remediation Phase I was projected to generate construction related emissions in excess of the District's Threshold of Significance for construction emissions. Those emissions were estimated to be 95.54 lbs/day NOX. After review of the URBEMIS computer model run in Appendix C, we believe those emissions may be underestimated. The amount of equipment used in this model run is not consistent with the District's Guidance as reflected in the Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) document which supplements the District's Guide to Air Quality Assessment. The FAQ can be found on the District's website www.airquality.org. (see pg. 2, *question 3*). *The FAQ states that "for projects that are smaller than 10 acres, don't use the "actively graded #. Instead use all the acres in the project."* The reason for that is that contractors tend to work the entire parcel when the acreage is less than 10 acres. In this case, *9.1 acres would be the amount considered as "actively graded" and the off-road equipment should be consistent with that acreage, i.e .91 crawler tractors and .91 rubber tired loaders. Because of the change in estimated equipment, we would expect projected emissions to increase somewhat for this phase.* We recommend this analysis for Remediation Phase I be redone. 7-2

The DEIR *states that the remediation phase would result in a potentially significant impact but it fails to apply the appropriate SMAQMD-recommended on-site construction mitigation measure because it states "the majority of NOx emissions resulting from remediation would be generated from on-road diesel trucks." The District recommends that for projects which are significant for construction, the District "standard construction mitigation" (enclosed) be applied, regardless of whether or not the majority of emissions come from off-road or on-road vehicles. There will be some off-road equipment used in this project and that equipment should be subject to the reduced emissions standards set forth in the recommended mitigation.* 7-3

777 12th Street, 3rd Floor ▪ Sacramento, CA 95814-1908
916/874-4800 ▪ 916/874-4899 fax
www.airquality.org

Lacking on-site construction mitigation, the document applies the District off-site mitigation fee program to all of the significant emissions above the District's threshold of significance. According to the DEIR, the fee will be $3,542. We recommend this calculation be re-run, taking into account that the off-road emissions should be mitigated by 20%. It may be that the current District fee mitigation spreadsheet will need to be modified for it to account for both the on-road and off-road equipment in the grading phase. Feel free to consult with us about that. A copy of the spreadsheet is attached. 7-3 continued

Finally, the document identifies that the project will generate significant operational emissions and it requires the preparation and endorsement of an operational Air Quality Mitigation Plan. We suggest the proponent contact us as soon as possible in order to start on the creation of that Plan. Enclosed, you will find a list of measures which are used in such Plans. The list is entitled "Draft Update" because the District is undergoing a revision of its list of operational mitigation measures. For more information, please contact me. 7-4

All projects are subject to SMAQMD rules and regulations in effect at the time of construction. Please see the attached document describing SMAQMD Rules which may apply to this project. 7-5

If you have questions, please contact me at 874-4885 or jborkenhagen@airquality.org

Sincerely,

Jeane Borkenhagen

Jeane Borkenhagen
Associate Air Quality Planner Analyst

cc: Larry Robinson — SMAQMD
Jim Rinehart — City of Sacramento

Enc: SMAQMD Rules & Regulations Statement
SMAQMD Recommended Mitigation for Reducing Emissions from Heavy- Duty Construction Vehicles
Construction Emissions Mitigation Fee Calculation
Table of Measures from Draft Update to SMAQMD Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions
Draft Update to SMAQMD Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions

SMAQMD Rules & Regulations Statement

*The following statement is recommended as standard condition of approval or construction document language for **all** construction projects within the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD):*

All projects are subject to SMAQMD rules and regulations in effect at the time of construction. A complete listing of current rules is available at www.airquality.org or by calling 916.874.4800. Specific rules that may relate to construction activities may include, but are not limited to:

Rule 201: General Permit Requirements. Any project that includes the use of equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere may require permit(s) from SMAQMD prior to equipment operation. The applicant, developer, or operator of a project that includes an emergency generator, boiler, or heater should contact the District early to determine if a permit is required, and to begin the permit application process. Portable construction equipment (e.g. generators, compressors, pile drivers, lighting equipment, etc) with an internal combustion engine over 50 horsepower are required to have a SMAQMD permit or a California Air Resources Board portable equipment registration.

Rule 403: Fugitive Dust. The developer or contractor is required to control dust emissions from earth moving activities or any other construction activity to prevent airborne dust from leaving the project site.

Rule 442: Architectural Coatings. The developer or contractor is required to use coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the rule.

Rule 902: Asbestos. The developer or contractor is required to notify SMAQMD of any regulated renovation or demolition activity. Rule 902 contains specific requirements for surveying, notification, removal, and disposal of asbestos containing material.

Other general types of uses that require a permit include dry cleaners, gasoline stations, spray booths, and operations that generate airborne particulate emissions.

SMAQMD Recommended Mitigation for Reducing Emissions from Heavy-Duty Construction Vehicles

Only For Projects With Construction Emissions Above the CEQA Threshold of Significance

Revised December 9, 2005

Category 1: Reducing NOx emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment

The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the lead agency and 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 NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction[1] compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction; and

The project representative shall submit to the lead agency and 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.

and:

Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment

The project shall 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 the lead agency 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. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supercede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.

---

[1]Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.

Construction Emissons Mitigation Fee Calculation

PART 1: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:

Control/Application #:

Single Family Dwelling Units:		*Note: Enter information only in blue bordered cells*	
Multi Family Dwelling Units:		Total Residential Acreage:	
Non-residential Square Feet:		Total Non-residential Acreage:	

PART 2: EMISSIONS INFORMATION

Year	Activity Phase	NOx (lbs/day) unmitigated	NOx (lbs/day) mitigated*	NOx over threshold (lbs/day)	duration (days)	Total significant NOx (lbs)
	Demolition (on road)					
	Demolition (off road)		0.00			
	TOTAL Demolition	0.00	0.00	0		0.00
*	Grading		0.00	0		0.00
	Building Construction		0.00	0		0.00
	Building Construction		0.00	0		0.00
	Building Construction		0.00	0		0.00
	Asphalt		0.00	0		0.00
	Total project Nox over threshold (lbs)		*0.00*			
	Total project Nox over threshold (tons)		*0.00*			

PART 3: MITIGATION FEE RESULTS

TOTAL MITIGATION FEE ($14,300/TON)* ***$0***

>>> *Fee is to be paid to the SMAQMD, either in total or on a by acre basis, prior to any ground disturbance.*

Mitigation Fee ($/acre) **#DIV/0!**

* Assumes a construction mitigation plan which achieves a 20% reduction in NOx from on-site, off-road equipment.

** Or the $/ton of NOx cost-effectiveness value in effect at the time the fee is collected.

* May need to revise spreadsheet to account for on-road vs off-road grading emissions

COMMENT LETTER 7: Jeane Borkenhagen, SMAQMD

Response to Comment 7-1:

The commenter introduces the letter, indicating that the letter is a correction to a previous letter submitted to the City providing comment to the DEIR. The SMAQMD has indicated that the City should disregard the previous letter. Therefore, the previous letter is not included in the FEIR. Responses to the revised letter are included below. The comment does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures included in the Fulton Avenue DEIR (Initial Study).

Response to Comment 7-2

The commenter indicates that the URBEMS Model prepared for Phase I of the Remediation contains an inconsistency with the Air District's Guidance as reflected in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, which supplements the SMAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. The FAQ document indicates that, for project sites under 10 acres, it should be assumed for the URBEMIS Model that the entire project site is "actively graded." However, the assumptions for the URBEMIS Model (See Appendix C of the DEIR), indicate that, although the area for clay pigeon removal would be smaller than 10 acres (9.1 acres), the actively graded acreage is 25% of the project site (which is appropriate only for project sites 10 acres or larger). Because the "actively graded" acreage dictates the number of pieces of construction equipment, the original URBEMIS Model assumed fewer pieces of equipment than should have been assumed for a site less than 10 acres. This, consequently, affected the emissions estimate output by the Model. Therefore, based on this error, the commenter indicates that the URBEMIS Model for the Phase I Remediation be redone.

The commenter is correct in pointing out this technical error. The URBEMIS Model for Phase I of the Remediation has been re-run. The results are available as a Appendix A of this FEIR.

The corrected URBEMIS Model indicates higher construction-related emissions than previously analyzed for Phase I of the Remediation, which, consequently, requires increased mitigation fees. Please see the Response to Comment 5-3 below for the specific changes to the DEIR text.

Response to Comment 7-3

The commenter indicates that the District recommends using the District's standard construction mitigation for projects that are above the SMAQMD threshold for construction-related emissions. As explained in the DEIR (p. 3.1-9), this mitigation was not included due to the fact that the URBEMIS Model results indicated that the construction emissions generated from off-road construction equipment would be 4.34 lbs/day. A 20 percent reduction of 4.34 lbs/day (0.87 lbs/day) was considered negligible, and these emissions were, instead, mitigated

as part of the overall mitigation fees for the project. However, the commenter indicates that because some off-road equipment would be used for the project that the equipment should be subject to this mitigation. The commenter further indicates that the mitigation fees should be recalculated assuming the 20 percent NOx reduction for inclusion of the standard construction mitigation.

In addition, as indicated in Response to Comment 5-2, above, the URBEMIS Model for Phase I of the Remediation has been re-run (the results are available as an Appendix to this FEIR). The updated URBEMIS results indicate that the construction emissions generated from off-road construction equipment would be 39.98 lbs/day (as opposed to 4.34 lbs/day in the original URBEMIS results). Consequently, application of the standard construction mitigation would reduce off-road construction equipment emissions by approximately 8.0 lbs/day.

Therefore, based on the comments provided by the SMAQMD, the text of the DEIR is hereby revised, as follows (~~strikethrough~~ = deleted text; double-underline = added text):

3.1-1R Remediation could generate emissions that would exceed City and SMAQMD thresholds.

Remediation of the project site would include demolition of existing structures, as well as grading, excavation, and soil moving activities, which would result in emission of criteria pollutants, which are regulated by the California Air Resources Board through the local air districts.

Tables 3.1-4 and 3.1-5 provide a summary of results for the construction-related impacts for each of the remediation project intervals as compared to the City of Sacramento and SMAQMD significance thresholds.

Table 3.1-4
Emissions Estimates Versus Significance Thresholds for Remediation Phase I

Pollutant	Daily Emission Comparison		
	Daily Threshold (pounds)	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	Daily Threshold Exceeded?
CO	None	~~22.48~~69.34	NA
NOx	**85**	**~~95.54~~131.24**	**Yes**
PM_{10}	None	~~25.25~~94.90	NA-
SO_2	None	0.16	NA
ROG	None	~~5.31~~10.90	NA

NA- Not applicable since no threshold exists.

Table 3.1-5
Emissions Estimates Versus Significance Thresholds for Remediation Phase II

Pollutant	Daily Emission Comparison		
	Daily Threshold (pounds)	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	Daily Threshold Exceeded?
CO	None	38.59	NA
NOx	**85**	74.27	No
PM_{10}	None	52.19	NA
SO_2	None	0.09	NA
ROG	None	6.10	NA

NA- Not applicable since no threshold exists

It should be noted that the SMAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County* states (p. 3-2) that if a project's NOx mass emissions from heavy-duty mobile sources is determined not potentially significant using the recommended methodologies (such as URBEMIS) for estimating emissions, then the Lead Agency may assume that exhaust emissions of other pollutants from operation of equipment and worker commute vehicles are also not significant. Therefore, because NOx emissions (74.27 lbs/day) generated by Phase II of the remediation would not exceed thresholds, the emissions would also not exceed City or SMAQMD thresholds for CO,PM_{10}, ROG, and SO2. However, the short term construction-related activities associated with Phase I of the remediation are estimated to generate ~~95.54~~131.24 lbs/day of NOx, which is ~~10.54~~46.24 lbs/day over the threshold. Therefore, the remediation would result in a **potentially significant** impact.

SMAQMD has provided specific mitigation for projects with construction emissions that exceed the threshold of significance for NOx. This mitigation includes demonstration of a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction, monitoring of off-road vehicle exhaust opacity, as well as submission of an off-road construction equipment inventory. However, this mitigation applies only to off-road construction equipment. The majority of NOx emissions resulting from the remediation would be generated by on-road diesel trucks. This is due to the large number of trucks (10) required to off-haul the clay pigeons, as well as the travel distance (118 miles per truck—round trip) to convey the pigeons to the disposal site in Manteca. ~~Therefore, this mitigation specified by SMAQMD for reduction of NOx emissions would not apply to the proposed remediation.~~ Implementation of this mitigation (see MM 3.1-2R) would therefore reduce the emissions generated by the off-road construction vehicles (39.98 lbs/day) by 20 percent (8.0 lbs/day). This reduces the overall NOx emissions for Phase I of the Remediation to 123.24 lbs/day.

However, SMAQMD has developed a mitigation program that assists in providing cleaner emissions technology within the region. A fee could be

paid to this program to offset the emissions over the significance threshold generated from the proposed remediation. The fee is calculated based on the amount of the mitigated construction emissions produced by the remediation less the District Threshold, multiplied by the number of days of construction multiplied by the standard District fee of $14,300/ton of NOx**.** Through compliance with this mitigation fee (see MM 3.1-1R), it is anticipated that the short-term impacts from NOx can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Therefore, a mitigation fee of ~~$3,542~~$12,850 is required, in combination with the 20 percent off-road construction vehicle mitigation, to reduce impacts resulting from the proposed remediation to a **less than significant** level. The mitigation fee is calculated as follows:

1. ~~95.54~~123.24 lbs/day - 85.00 lbs/day threshold= ~~10.54~~38.24 lbs/day over threshold
2. ~~10.54~~38.24 lbs/day x 47 days of clay pigeon removal = ~~495.38~~1,797.28 lbs
3. ~~495.38~~1,797.28 lbs ÷ 2,000 lbs/ton = ~~0.2477~~0.8986 tons
4. ~~0.2477~~0.8986 tons x $14,300/ton = **~~$3,542~~$12,850**

Mitigation Measures

MM 3.1-1R Prior to ground disturbance the City shall make payment to the SMAQMD the off-site air quality mitigation fee of ~~$3,542~~$12,850.

MM3.1-2R(a) The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the Development Services Department and AQMD, 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 NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction (acceptable options for reducing emissions include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available); and the City shall submit to AQMD 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 AQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.

MM3.1-2R(b) The City shall 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 the AQMD 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. The AQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other AQMD or state rules or regulations.

Response to Comment 7-4

The commenter indicates that the project proponent should consult with the SMAQMD, as soon as possible, to begin coordination on the Air Quality Mitigation Plan, as required by Mitigation Measure 3.1-1D in the DEIR. This request has been forwarded to the developer. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Response to Comment 7-5

The commenter indicates that all projects are subject to SMAQMD rules and regulations. This comment does not raise issues with the adequacy of the Fulton Avenue Development DEIR and does not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures therein.

Letter 8

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Sean Walsh
Director

RECEIVED
NOV 29 2006

November 21, 2006

Mike Parker
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834

Subject: Fulton Avenue Development Project
SCH#: 2005122130

Dear Mike Parker:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on November 20, 2006, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

8-1

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2005122130
Project Title Fulton Avenue Development Project
Lead Agency Sacramento, City of

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description The proposed project consists of two components: remediation of the 20-acre site and entitlements to allow development of two 90,000 square foot auto dealerships on a total of 20 acres adjacent to Haggin Oaks Golf Course. Implementation of the proposed development component is contingent upon the approval of a remediation plan for the site currently under review by the County. Specific entitlements for the project include: (1) General Plan Amendment to redesignate the project site from Parks/Recreation/Open Space to Heavy Commercial; (2) Rezone of the project site from R-1 to Heavy Commercial (C-4); (3) approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide the approximately 456-acre parcel into three parcels of 10.8 acres, 6.7 acres and 436.1 acres, including a 2.5-acre right of way for the Fulton Avenue extension; (4) establishment of a Planned Use Development (PUD) with Schematic Plan and PUD Guidelines; and (5) three subdivision modifications for the extension of Fulton Avenue.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Mike Parker
Agency City of Sacramento
Phone (916) 808-7483 **Fax**
email
Address 2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
City Sacramento **State** CA **Zip** 95834

Project Location

County Sacramento
City Sacramento
Region
Cross Streets Fulton Avenue and Interstate 80
Parcel No. 254-0011-027, 240-0330-008, 009
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways I-80
Airports
Railways
Waterways Arcade Creek
Schools Loretto HS, Mira Loma HS
Land Use GPD: Parks, Recreation, Open Space
Z: Standard Single Family Residential (R-1)

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Cumulative Effects; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Fiscal Impacts; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Department of Parks and Recreation; Native American Heritage Commission; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Department of Water Resources; Department of Conservation; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3; Department of Toxic Substances Control

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

Date Received	10/06/2006	***Start of Review***	10/06/2006	***End of Review***	11/20/2006

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – THE RESOURCES AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 942360001
(916) 653-5791

October 12, 2006

Clear 11-20-06 e

RECEIVED
OCT 16 2006
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Mike Parker
City of Sacramento
2101 Arena Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95834

Fulton Avenue Development Project
State Clearinghouse (SCH) Number: ~~2005122130~~ 2005122130

The project corresponding to the subject SCH identification number has come to our attention. The limited project description suggests your project may be an encroachment on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. You may refer to the California Code of Regulations, Title 23 and Designated Floodway maps at http://recbd.ca.gov/. Please be advised that your county office also has copies of the Board's designated floodways for your review. If indeed your project encroaches on an adopted food control plan, you will need to obtain an encroachment permit from the Reclamation Board prior to initiating any activities. The attached Fact Sheet explains the permitting process. Please note that the permitting process may take as much as 45 to 60 days to process. Also note that a condition of the permit requires the securing all of the appropriate additional permits before initiating work. This information is provided so that you may plan accordingly.

If after careful evaluation, it is your assessment that your project is not within the authority of the Reclamation Board, you may disregard this notice. For further information, please contact Sam Brandon of my staff at (916) 574-0651.

Sincerely,

Mike Mirmazaheri, Chief
Floodway Protection Section

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

COMMENT LETTER 8: Terry Roberts, OPR

Response to Comment 8-1:

The commenter indicates that comment letters from responding state agencies are enclosed. One letter is attached, which is from the Department of Water resources. This letter was also submitted directly to the City and is included in this FEIR as Comment Letter 2.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the DEIR and does not alter the conclusions and/or mitigation measures therein.

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires review of any project that could have significant adverse effects o the environment. In 1988, CEQA was amended to require reporting on and monitoring of mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process. This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) is designed to aid the City of Sacramento in its implementation and monitoring of measures adopted from the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Fulton Avenue Remediation and Development.

Mitigation Measures

All Mitigation measures identified in the DEIR and in the Initial Study are included in this MMP. The MMP describes the actions that must take place to implement each mitigation measure, the timing of those actions, and the entities responsible for implementing and monitoring the actions. The MMP is divided into two parts: Remediation and Development.

MMP Components

Impact: This column summarizes the impact stated in the DEIR.

Mitigation Measure: All mitigation measures that were identified n the DEIR are presented and numbered as they are in the DEIR. The mitigation measures from the Initial Study are identified by topic and number.

Action: For every mitigation measure identified, one or more required actions are described. These actions describe the means by which the mitigation measure will be implemented and, in some instances, the criteria for determining whether a measure has been successfully implemented. Where mitigation measures are particularly detailed, the action may refer back to the mitigation measure.

Implementation Party: This item identifies the entity that will perform the required action.

Timing: Each action must take place prior to the time at which a threshold could be exceeded. Implementation of the action must occur prior to or during some part of approval, project design or construction or on an ongoing basis. The timing for each measure is identified.

Monitoring Party: The City of Sacramento is responsible for ensuring that most mitigation measures are successfully implemented. Within the city, a number of departments and divisions will have responsibility for monitoring some aspect of the overall project. Occasionally, monitoring parties outside the city are identified; these parties are referred to as “Responsible Agencies” by CEQA.

FULTON AVENUE REMEDIATION
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
Remediation – 3.1 Air Quality					
3.1-1R: Remediation could generate emissions that would exceed City and SMAQMD thresholds.	MM 3.1-1R: Prior to ground disturbance the City shall make payment to the SMAQMD the off-site air quality mitigation fee of $12,850.	Pay mitigation fee to SMAQMD.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services SMAQMD
3.1-2R: Remediation would include short term construction activities that could contribute to cumulative pollutant emissions	MM3.1-2R(a): The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the Development Services Department and AQMD, 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 NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction (acceptable options for reducing emissions include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available); and the City shall submit to AQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction	Provide mitigation plan to SMAQMD for emissions reductions measures for off-road construction vehicles.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services SMAQMD

	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 AQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. MM3.1-2R(b)**:** The City shall 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 the AQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual	Monitor construction exhaust for opacity and report noncompliance to SMAQMD.	City of Sacramento	During remediation activities	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services SMAQMD

	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. The AQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other AQMD or state rules or regulations.				
Remediation – 3.2 Biological Resources					
3.2-1R: Remediation would result in the permanent removal of seasonal wetland swales and channel from the project site, which could result in impacts to special-status vernal pool invertebrates.	MM 3.2-1R(a): The wetlands identified as potential habitat for federal-listed branchiopods (vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp) are presumed occupied by these branchiopods, unless written documentation is provided from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that the negative results of protocol surveys have been accepted. Therefore, prior to ground disturbance, the following measures shall be included on all grading plans. • No grading shall occur within 50 feet of wetlands occupied by or assumed to be	Include measures on grading plans.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services USFWS

	occupied by federal listed branchiopods until the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has issued a Biological Opinion to authorize the take of the listed species. • It is the Contractor's responsibility to comply with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations including the Federal Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act. • Temporary fencing shall be installed around the 50-foot buffer surrounding wetlands occupied by or assumed to be occupied by federally listed branchiopods to exclude construction equipment until the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has either accepted negative results of protocol surveys or has issued a Biological Opinion to authorize the take of the listed species.				
	MM 3.2-1R(b): The City shall provide compensatory mitigation as required by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for federally listed branchiopods.	Provide compensatory mitigation for listed branchiopods.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services USFWS
	MM 3.2-1R(c): During Section 7 consultation process with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the City is required to prepare a mitigation plan for submittal to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The mitigation plan will be	Submittal of mitigation plan to USFWS for listed branchiopods, and implementation of the plan.	City of Sacramento	During Section 7 consultation with USFWS and prior to ground disturbance.	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services USFWS

	required to include the following components for direct and indirect impacts. • Avoidance Component. Demonstrate how the project has been designed to minimize impacts to federal-listed vernal pool crustaceans and their habitat (e.g. biological monitoring and special-status species training for construction personnel). • Preservation Component. For every acre of habitat directly affected, at least two (2) vernal pool credits will be dedicated within a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-approved ecosystem preservation bank (2:1 ratio). • Conservation Component. For every acre of habitat directly affected, at least one (1) vernal pool creation credit will be dedicated within a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Approved habitat mitigation bank. In the event that preservation or conservation credits are not available for purchase at the time of mitigation implementation, the deposit of funds into a Species Fund in lieu fee program, the amount of money to be deposited determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be acceptable to satisfy both the preservation and conservation components of the				

	mitigation plan. Prior to ground disturbance, the City shall implement the mitigation set forth above for federally listed branchiopods as required by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.				
3.2-2R: Remediation cold result in the discharge of fill into Federally protected wetlands or other waters of the U.S.	MM 3.2-2R: Prior to ground disturbance, the City shall complete the process with the U.S Army Corps of Engineers for the discharge of fill into potential waters of the U.S.	Complete process with Corps for fill of potential waters of the US.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance.	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services USACE
	MM 3.2-3R: implement MM 3.2-1R(a-c)	(see MM 3.2-1R(a-c))	(see MM 3.2-1R(a-c))	(see MM 3.2-1R(a-c))	(see MM 3.2-1R(a-c))
3.2-3R: Remediation could impact nesting and/or foraging Swainson's hawk and other special-status raptors.	MM 3.2-4R(a): Prior to ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist, within 30 days prior to construction, to determine whether any Swainson's hawk nest trees will be removed on sited, or active Swainson's hawk best sites occur within ½ mile of the development site. These surveys shall be conducted according to the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee's (May 31, 2000) methodology or updated methodologies, as approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), using experienced Swainson's hawk	Complete pre-construction survey for Swainson's hawk within 30 days prior to construction.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services CDFG

	surveyors.				
	MM 3.2-4R(b): If breeding Swainson's hawks (i.e. exhibiting nest building or nesting behavior) are identified no new disturbances (e.g. heavy equipment operation associated with construction) shall occur within ½ mile of an active nest between March 1 and September 15, or until a qualified biologist, with concurrence by CDFG, has determined that young have fledged or that the nest is no longer occupied. If the active nest site is located within ¼ mile of existing urban development, the no new disturbance zone can be limited to the ¼ mile versus the ½ mile.	If breeding Swainson's hawks are identified, no new disturbances within ½ mile (1/4 mile if within urban development) of nest between March 1 and September 1, or until a biologist and DFG have determined young have fledged.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services CDFG
	MM 3.2-4R(c): If construction or other project related activities which may cause nest abandonment or forced fledging are proposed within the ¼ mile buffer zone, intensive monitoring (funded by the project sponsor) by a Department of Fish and Game approved raptor biologist will be required. Exact implementation of this measure will be based on specific site conditions.	Intensive monitoring by DFG approved biologist for construction activities within buffer zone.	City of Sacramento	During construction activities	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services CDFG
	MM 3.2-4R(d): Trees on the site that need to be removed to accommodate construction shall be felled between	Tree removal shall occur between September 15 and January 31. For tree	City of Sacramento	Prior to tree removal.	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services

	September 15 and January 31, outside of the general nesting season for raptors and other birds. Alternately, a pre-construction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted prior to tree removal between February 1 and September 15. Temporal restrictions shall be determined by a qualified biologist.	removal outside these dates, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted.			CDFG USFWS
	MM 3.2-5R: Prior to ground disturbance, the City shall be required to purchase compensatory Swainson's hawk foraging habitat credits for each developed acre, at the required ratio, from an approved mitigation bank, or develop other arrangements acceptable to and approved be the CDFG.	Purchase Swainson's hawk foraging habitat credits.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento Department of Development Services CDFG
3.2-4R: Remediation would result in impacts to trees protected under the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance.	MM 3.2-6R: Prior to initiation of remediation activities, the City shall submit a landscape plan for the review and approval of the Urban Forest Services Division indicating the planting of 47 48-inch box trees. Species selection shall be approved by the City Arborist prior to planting. OR If the project site cannot accommodate the planting of these trees, the City shall purchase the trees and plant at a specified location approved	Submittal of a landscape plan indicating 47 48-inch box trees from approved species selection, or, if not feasible, purchase and planting of the trees at an approved location.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division

	by the City Arborist. Species selection shall be approved by the City Arborist prior to planting.				
	MM 3.2-7R: During grading and construction activities, the City (or designee) shall provide an ISA certified arborist to periodically monitor the project site to ensure that the required tree preservation techniques are being implemented, and also to coordinate with planning and construction staff. All heritage size trees identified for removal shall be posted not less than 30 days prior to removal.	Monitoring of construction to ensure implementation of preservation techniques. Posting of heritage size trees for removal.	City of Sacramento	Prior to and during grading and construction activities	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division
	MM 3.2-8R: Prior to construction, the City (or designee) shall submit a tree preservation plan for the review and approval of the Urban Forest Services Division. The tree preservation plan shall be based on the recommendations within the Arborist Report prepared by Sierra Nevada Arborists (August 2006). The tree preservation plan shall also include the following measure identified by the City Arborist. The City, or designee, shall construct and maintain protective fencing around tree root zones for trees 40, 77, 85, 86, 90, 94, and 95, as well as any tree within Caltrans right-of-	Submittal of tree preservation plan to Urban Forest Services	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division

	way. Using a six (6) foot high cyclone fences, the project arborist shall ensure that drip zone areas are protected. The drip zone of each preserved tree shall remain empty during the project. No tools, vehicles and building material shall be stored within the protective fencing. No dumping or solutions, chemicals and construction slurries shall occur in the drip zone of each tree.				
	MM 3.2-9R: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Urban Forest Services Division shall review the grading plan to ensure that grade changes greater than 12-inches above or below original grade would not occur within the drip lime of trees 40, 77, 85, 86, 90, 94, and 95, or any tree with Caltrans right-if-way. If grade changes greater than 12-inches are indicated on the grading plan, the City Arborist shall provide additional requirements for specialized aeration and/or drainage systems to aid in tree survival/	Grading plan to be reviewed by Urban Forest Services for grade changes.	City of Sacramento	Prior to issuance of grading permit or grading of the site.	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division
	MM3.2-10R: Trees 40, 77, 85, 86, 90, 94, and 95 shall be appropriately irrigated (twice per week) during the period of April 1st to October 30th. If irrigation is not currently accessible, irrigation shall be installed or otherwise provided.	Provision of appropriate irrigation to identified trees.	City of Sacramento	City Arborist to verify irrigation schedule prior to grading activities.	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division

	MM 3.2-11R: All root pruning shall be performed by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist. Exposed roots greater than 2-inches in diameter shall be inspected and pruned prior to backfill/installation of hardscape. Once exposed, the project arborist shall determine if tree removal is required due to excessive root pruning, and shall immediately notify the City Arborist with the determination.	Root pruning to be performed by a certified Arborist with inspections of exposed roots and notification of City Arborist if removal is required.	City of Sacramento	During construction activities	City of Sacramento, Urban Forest Services Division
Remediation – 3.3 Cultural Resources					
3.3-2R: Remediation activities could impact known and/or unknown archeological resources.	MM 3.3-1R(a): In the event that any prehistoric subsurface archeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soul ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, obsidian and/or mortars, are discovered during construction related earth-moving activities, all work within 50 meters of the resources shall be halted, and the City shall consult with a qualified archeologist to assess the significance of the find. Archeological test excavations shall be conducted by a qualified archeologist to aid in determining the nature and integrity of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archeologist, representatives of the City and the qualified archaeologist shall coordinate to determine the	Halt work within 50 meters of the location of the discovery of any cultural resources; coordinate with the City.	City of Sacramento	During Construction	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	appropriate course of action. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis and professional museum curation. In addition, a report shall be prepared by the qualified archeologist according to current professional standards.				
	MM 3.3-1R(b): If a Native American site is discovered, the evaluation process shall include consultation with the appropriate Native American representatives. If Native American archeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archaeologists, who are certified by the Society of Professional Archeologists (SOPA) and/or meet the federal standards as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR 61), and Native American representatives, who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions. In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. If historic archeological sites are	Consultation with appropriate Native American representatives, if a Native American site is discovered; identification and treatment of artifacts to be conducted by qualified acheologists.	City of Sacramento	During Construction	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	involved, all identified treatment is to be carried out y qualified historical archeologists, who shall meet either Register of Professional Archeologists (RPA), or 36CFR 61 requirements. MM 3.3-2R: If a human bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work shall stop within 50 meters of the find, and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who shall notify the person most likely believed to be a descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the contractor to develop a program for re-internment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work is to take place within the immediate vicinity of the land until the identified appropriate actions have taken place.	Halt work within 50 meters of the location of the discovery of any human remains; contact the County Coroner. Work with descendent to develop re-internment plan.	City of Sacramento	During Construction	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department
Remediation – 3.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
3.4-1R: Remediation would result in activities that could expose people to contaminated soil.	MM 3.4-1R(a): Dust control measures shall be implemented during remediation activities, which may include one or more of the following: a) Use of water spraying over soil when performing dust-creating activities. b) Limiting the number of soil	Implement specified dust control measures.	City of Sacramento	During remediation activities	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	disturbing activities being performed at one time such that no visible dust is observed. c) Minimizing drop heights stockpiles while loading or unloading soil. d) Covering soil stockpiles when not being added or removed. e) Limiting vehicle speeds in the remediation area to five miles per hour. f) Sweeping paved roadways on-site and off-site near exit routes daily, or more frequently, if necessary. g) Stopping soil disturbing activities when wind speed exceeds 25 miles per hour.				
	MM 3.4-1R(b) The following measures shall be used to minimize the potential for contaminants to be transported outside the site on equipment or vehicles: a) All vehicles must be scraped or brushed to remove soil prior to leaving the remediation area. b) Use of a stabilized construction entrance (gravel site exits) to assist in the removal of soil from tires. c) If soil cannot be removed effectively by brushing or scraping, high-pressure washing may be employed to remove soil from equipment. Water used in washing	Implement specified measures to minimize transportation of contaminants off of the site.	City of Sacramento	During remediation activities	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	operations shall be contained and managed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local waste regulations. MM 3.4-1R(c) The following mitigation measures shall be used to minimize potential exposures due to releases from spills or runoff: a) A vehicle staging area will be set up in the southwest corner of the proposed project area, which will be used for parking heavy equipment and storage of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, etc) that may be used during the remediation. b) Materials will be stored in appropriate containers. c) Hazardous materials releases, such as spills of oil, petroleum fuels, and hydraulic fluids, or releases of contaminated soil/sediment will be managed through use of Best Management Practices to manage storm water and other discharges, as required by City of Sacramento Municipal Code (Chapter 13.16). The contractor shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which must contain procedures for responding to hazardous materials releases, such as use of absorbent material and proper management of the resultant waste.	Implement specified measures to minimize potential exposures due to releases from spills or runoff.	City of Sacramento	During remediation activities	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	d) The staging area will have secondary containment as appropriate for materials being used, and equipment/supplies needed to handle spills and disposal of contaminated materials.				
	MM 3.4-1R(d): The remediation contractor is required to prepare a site-specific health and safety plan that discusses basic procedural and minimum equipment requirements for worker protection in accordance with Federal OSHA 29 CFR 1910 and 1926. All employees and site visitors will be subject to the provisions of the Health and Safety Plan. The Plan shall also include provisions for dust monitoring along the site perimeter and define applicable action levels that would trigger additional dust control measures if the action levels are exceeded.	Health and safety plan is to include provisions for dust monitoring along the site perimeter, and is to define action levels that would trigger additional measures.	City of Sacramento	Prior to ground disturbance.	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department
	MM 3.4-1R(e): After recordation of the parcel map and prior to occupancy of the buildings, a Deed Restriction shall be recorded for Parcel B that includes at a minimum the following provisions: a) The Deed Restriction must run with the land and be imposed in perpetuity and shall restrict land uses on the site (no single family residential or other	Deed restriction placed on Parcel B, including specified provisions.	City of Sacramento	After recordation of parcel map and prior to occupancy of buildings.	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	sensitive land uses). b) Identify the continuing presence of hazardous materials and describe the use limitations on the property. c) Every year the landowner or lessee shall conduct an inspection of the integrity of the cap. d) The inspection shall consist of visual inspections along longitudinal (north to south) traverses every 100 feet. e) Observations shall be made as to cap cracking, erosional damage, settlement, sloughing, seepage, or other damage to the cap. f) Any deterioration of the cap shall be noted and repairs must be implemented. g) The inspection shall be documented and submitted to the County annually in January.				
3.4-2R: Activities associated with remediation of the site could expose people to asbestos containing materials, lead-based paint, PCBs, and other hazardous materials.	MM 3.4-2R: Prior to building demolition, an Asbestos Building Materials Survey will be conducted by an AHERA Accredited Asbestos Consultant or Site Surveillance Technician certified by the State of California. A Lead-Based Paint Survey will be conducted by a certified lead inspector accredited by the State of California Department of Health Services (DHS). If such materials are found, and prior to ay demolition that could disturb	Conduct an Asbestos Building Materials Survey and a Lead-Based Paint Survey by certified technicians. If such materials are found, retain a qualified abatement contractor.	City of Sacramento	Prior to building demolition.	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	the materials, the City will retain a qualified abatement contractor to properly remove and dispose of these materials, in accordance with applicable regulations.				
Remediation – 5.13 Traffic and Circulation					
3.6-6R: Remediation could result in short-term impacts on traffic due to the removal of the clay pigeon debris.	MM 3.6-6R: A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) shall be prepared prior to removal of the clay pigeon debris. The TMP shall be reviewed and approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the City's Department of Transportation (DOT). During construction, the State shall monitor compliance with the TMP on I-80 (Business) and the City shall monitor compliance on Fulton Road. The TMP shall include, but is not limited to, the following items: a) Identification of areas requiring encroachment with the public right-of-way. b) Identification of any necessary signing. c) Identification of routes and hours for the movement of construction vehicles that would minimize the impacts on circulation of vehicular traffic in the project study area to avoid hindrance of the general flow of traffic in the vicinity of the project (i.e. avoiding peak hour	Prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) including the specified items.	City of Sacramento	Prior to removal of clay pigeon debris.	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department; Caltrans

	conditions). d) Use of the project site for placement or staging of construction equipment, vehicle, and materials to avoid additional trips to the project site. Designation of an on-site complaint and enforcement to respond to complaints and on-site posting of contact information (name and phone number) for the enforcement manager.				
Development – 3.1 Air Quality					
3.1-2D: The operation of the proposed automotive-related uses on the site would generate emissions of ozone precursors that exceed City and SMAQMD thresholds.	MM 3.1-1D: Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, the developer shall prepare and receive written endorsement from the SMAQMD of an operational Air Quality Mitigation Plan detailing the measures that shall be employed to reduce the proposed project's operational emissions by at least 15 percent. The project developer shall obtain the endorsement from the SMAQMD and provide it to the City's Environmental Planning Services Department.	Prepare, and receive endorsement from SMAQMD on, an operational Air Quality Mitigation Plan.	Developer	Prior to issuance of Certificates of Occupancy	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department; SMAQMD
3.1-4D: Development would include short term construction activities that could contribute to cumulative pollutant emissions.	MM 3.1-2D: The developer shall provide a plan, for approval by the City and SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned,	Provide a plan demonstrating fleet-wide reduction of NOx and an inventory of all off-road construction equipment (greater or equal to 50 horsepower).	Developer	Prior to grading activities and during construction	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department; SMAQMD

	leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction (acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available); and The developer shall submit to the City and 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	Emissions from construction vehicles not to exceed specified opacity.			

	SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman; and The developer shall 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 the City 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. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this mitigation measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.				

3.1-5D: The operation of the proposed automotive-related uses on the site would contribute to cumulative pollutant emissions.	MM 3.1-3D: Implement MM 3.1-1D.	See MM 3.1-1D	Developer	See MM 3.1-1D	See MM 3.1-1D
Development – 3.2 Biological Resources					
3.2-1D: Development could impact nesting Swainson's hawk and other special-status raptors.	MM 3.2-1D: Implement MM 3.2-4R(a – d)	See MM 3.2-4R(a-d)	Developer	See MM 3.2-4R(a-d)	See MM 3.2-4R(a-d)
3.2-2D: Development would result in impacts to trees protected under the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance.	MM 3.2-2D: Implement MM 3.2-6R through 3.2-11R	See MM 3.2-6R through 3.2-11R	Developer	See MM 3.2-6R through 3.2-11R	See MM 3.2-6R through 3.2-11R
Development – 3.3 Cultural Resources					
3.3-1D: Development could impact known and/or unknown archeologic resources.	MM 3.3-1D: Implement MM 3.3-1R(a, b) and MM 3.3-2	See MM 3.3-1R(a, b) and MM 3.3-2	Developer	See MM 3.3-1R(a, b) and MM 3.3-2	See MM 3.3-1R(a, b) and MM 3.3-2
Development – 3.5 Noise					
3.5-1D: The installation of trenchless tunneling could exceed the City and County Noise Control Ordinance standards	MM 3.5-1D(a): If trenchless tunneling is required to occur during the nighttime hours, use of construction equipment and material deliveries during the nighttime hours shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. Fixed and stationary equipment (e.g., compressors, cranes, generators) to be operated during the nighttime hours shall be shielded from direct line-of-	If trenchless tunneling is required during nighttime hours, minimize nighttime construction hours and shield fixed and stationary equipment from nigh-sensitive noise receptors.	Developer	During nighttime trenchless tunneling activities	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department

	site to nearby night-sensitive noise receptors (Clarion Hotel) located south of the project site by placement within enclosures or below surface grade, by use of temporary sound barriers/curtains, or by placement behind intervening structures or material storage piles, sufficient to interrupt line-of-sight to the Clarion Hotel. MM 3.5-1D(b): Construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.	Equip construction equipment with mufflers	Developer	During nighttime trenchless tunneling activities	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department
Development – 3.13 Traffic and Circulation					
3.6-1D Unacceptable levels of service at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and Business 80 westbound ramps (westbound approach) during the AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. Also, at this intersection the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant is met during all of the study peak hours.	MM 3.6-1D The project applicant shall install all-way stop sign controls at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and Business 80 westbound ramps. Installing all-way stop signs will improve traffic operations from LOS 'F' to LOS 'E' or better and reduce the impact of the project to less-than-significant.	Install all-way stop signs at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and Business 80 westbound ramps.	Developer	Prior to issuance of Certificates of Occupancy	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department Caltrans
3.6-2D The results indicate that the following merge/diverge influence areas would operate at unacceptable levels (LOS 'F'). • Business 80 EB off-ramp to Fulton	MM 3.6-2D No feasible mitigation measure has been identified that would reduce the impact of the project on the freeway. Widening the freeway near the Watt Avenue and Bell Street on/off ramps would reduce the impact, but is not considered feasible; therefore,	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Avenue during PM peak hour. • Business 80 EB on-ramp to Fulton Avenue during PM peak hour. • Business 80 WB off-ramp to Fulton Avenue during AM peak hour. • Business 80 WB on-ramp to Fulton Avenue during AM peak hour. Business 80 mainline would be operating at capacity and resulting in LOS 'F' at the above listed study merge/diverge area.	the project impact would remain significant-and-unavoidable.				
3.6-3D Inadequate storage at Business 80 westbound off-ramp at Fulton Avenue.	MM 3.6-3D Implementation of MM 3.6-1D.	See MM 3.6-1.	See MM 3.6-1.	See MM 3.6-1.	See MM 3.6-1.
3.6-4D Cumulative, unacceptable levels of service at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and Business 80 westbound ramps (westbound approach) during the AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. Also, at this intersection the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant is met during all of the study peak hours.	MM 3.6-4D The applicant shall coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and the Business 80 westbound ramps. Installing a traffic signal will improve the intersection operation from LOS 'F' to LOS 'D' or better.	Coordinate with Caltrans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Fulton Avenue and the Business 80 westbound ramps.	Developer	Prior to issuance of Certificates of Occupancy	City of Sacramento; Development Services Department Caltrans

3.6-5D Cumulative results indicate that the following merge/diverge influence areas would operate at unacceptable levels (LOS 'F'). • Eastbound off to Fulton Avenue during weekday PM peak hour. • Eastbound on from Fulton Avenue during weekday PM and Saturday peak hour. • Westbound off to Fulton Avenue during weekday AM peak hour. • Westbound on from Fulton Avenue during weekday AM peak hour. Business 80 mainline would be operating at capacity and resulting in LOS 'F' at the above listed study merge/diverge area.	MM 3.6-5D No feasible mitigation measure ahs been identified that would reduce the cumulative impact of the project on the freeway. Widening the freeway near the Watt Avenue and Bell Street on/off ramps would reduce the impact, but this is not considered feasible; therefore, the cumulative project impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX A UPDATED URBEMIS RESULTS

URBEMIS 2002 For Windows 8.7.0

File Name: S:\Environmental\Users\MParker\EIRs\Rapton Honda\EIR\FEIR\Appendix A\URBEMIS RE-RUN.urb
Project Name: URBEMIS Re-run Fulton Avenue Development
Project Location: Lower Sacramento Valley Air Basin
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions Based on EMFAC2002 version 2.2

SUMMARY REPORT
(Pounds/Day - Summer)

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

*** 2007 ***	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10 TOTAL	PM10 EXHAUST	PM10 DUST
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	10.90	131.24	69.34	0.16	94.90	3.53	91.37

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

SUM OF AREA AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

URBEMIS 2002 For Windows 8.7.0

File Name: S:\Environmental\Users\MParker\EIRs\Rapton Honda\EIR\FEIR\Appendix A\URBEMIS RE-RUN.urb
Project Name: URBEMIS Re-run Fulton Avenue Development
Project Location: Lower Sacramento Valley Air Basin
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions Based on EMFAC2002 version 2.2

DETAIL REPORT
(Pounds/Day - Summer)

Construction Start Month and Year: February, 2007
Construction Duration: 2.64
Total Land Use Area to be Developed: 9.1 acres
Maximum Acreage Disturbed Per Day: 9.1 acres
Single Family Units: 0 Multi-Family Units: 0
Retail/Office/Institutional/Industrial Square Footage: 0

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES UNMITIGATED (lbs/day)

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10 TOTAL	PM10 EXHAUST	PM10 DUST
*** 2007***							
Phase 1 - Demolition Emissions							
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	2.27	-	2.27
Off-Road Diesel	1.23	7.31	10.46	-	0.23	0.23	0.00
On-Road Diesel	1.56	30.66	5.75	0.05	0.78	0.66	0.12
Worker Trips	0.01	0.03	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum lbs/day	2.80	38.00	16.47	0.05	3.28	0.89	2.39
Phase 2 - Site Grading Emissions							
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	91.00	-	91.00
Off-Road Diesel	6.20	39.98	51.24	-	1.57	1.57	0.00
On-Road Diesel	4.65	91.17	17.09	0.16	2.33	1.96	0.37
Worker Trips	0.05	0.09	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum lbs/day	10.90	131.24	69.34	0.16	94.90	3.53	91.37
Phase 3 - Building Construction							
Bldg Const Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bldg Const Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Arch Coatings Off-Gas	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arch Coatings Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asphalt Off-Gas	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asphalt Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asphalt On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asphalt Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum lbs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Max lbs/day all phases	10.90	131.24	69.34	0.16	94.90	3.53	91.37

Phase 3 - Building Construction Assumptions: Phase Turned OFF
Start Month/Year for Phase 1: Feb '07
Phase 1 Duration: 0.5 months
Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 46854.3114157435
Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 5400.045225
On-Road Truck Travel (VMT): 1180
Off-Road Equipment

No.	Type	Horsepower	Load Factor	Hours/Day
1	Rubber Tired Loaders	165	0.465	8.0

Phase 2 - Site Grading Assumptions
Start Month/Year for Phase 2: Feb '07
Phase 2 Duration: 2.14 months
On-Road Truck Travel (VMT): 3504.6
Off-Road Equipment

No.	Type	Horsepower	Load Factor	Hours/Day
1	Crawler Tractors	143	0.575	8.0
1	Graders	174	0.575	8.0
1	Off Highway Trucks	417	0.490	8.0

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES (Summer Pounds per Day, Unmitigated)

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Hearth - No summer emissions					
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Consumer Prdcts	0.00	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	0.00	-	-	-	-
TOTALS(lbs/day,unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
TOTAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Does not include correction for passby trips.
Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips.

OPERATIONAL (Vehicle) EMISSION ESTIMATES

Analysis Year: 2005 Temperature (F): 85 Season: Summer

EMFAC Version: EMFAC2002 (9/2002)

Summary of Land Uses:

Unit Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	No. Units	Total Trips

Vehicle Assumptions:

Fleet Mix:

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto	56.10	2.30	97.10	0.60
Light Truck < 3,750 lbs	15.10	4.00	93.40	2.60
Light Truck 3,751- 5,750	15.50	1.90	96.80	1.30
Med Truck 5,751- 8,500	6.80	1.50	95.60	2.90
Lite-Heavy 8,501-10,000	1.00	0.00	80.00	20.00
Lite-Heavy 10,001-14,000	0.30	0.00	66.70	33.30
Med-Heavy 14,001-33,000	1.00	10.00	20.00	70.00
Heavy-Heavy 33,001-60,000	0.80	0.00	12.50	87.50
Line Haul > 60,000 lbs	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Urban Bus	0.10	0.00	0.00	100.00
Motorcycle	1.60	87.50	12.50	0.00
School Bus	0.30	0.00	0.00	100.00
Motor Home	1.40	14.30	78.60	7.10

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	9.7	3.8	4.6	7.8	4.5	4.5
Rural Trip Length (miles)	16.8	7.1	7.9	14.7	6.6	6.6
Trip Speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
% of Trips - Residential	27.3	21.2	51.5			

Changes made to the default values for Land Use Trip Percentages

Changes made to the default values for Construction

The user has overridden the Default Phase Lengths
Demolition Truck Hauling Miles/Round Trip changed from 30 to 118
Site Grading Truck Haul Capacity (yds3) changed from 20 to 10
Site Grading Miles/Round Trip changed from 20 to 118
Phase 2 mitigation measure On-Road Diesel Exhaust: Use lean-NOx catalyst
has been changed from off to on.

Changes made to the default values for Area

Changes made to the default values for Operations