



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
SERVICES

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

300 Richards Boulevard
Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

Bruceville American Dream (P06-134) - The proposed project would construct a 49-unit, small lot, single-family subdivision on approximately 6.9 vacant acres, within the Multi-Family (R-2B-PUD) zone. Project entitlements include a Tentative Map to subdivide five parcels totaling approximately 6.9 net acres into 49 parcels and two landscape lots, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Guidelines Amendment to allow small lot single-family residences within the Laguna Meadows Planned Unit Development, a PUD Schematic Plan Amendment and a Special Permit for alternative housing.

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

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892, adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained during normal business hours at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811.

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

By: Tom Buford
Date: 1/3/11

BRUCEVILLE AMERICAN DREAM (P06-134)

REVISED INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study has been prepared by the Community Development Department, Environmental Planning Services, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code.

The proposed project was revised following circulation of the initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for public review. Changes to the initial study are shown in ~~strike through~~ for deletions and underline for additional text.

ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

SECTION I - BACKGROUND: Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, and the date this Initial Study was completed.

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Reviews proposed project and states whether the project would have additional significant environmental effects (project-specific effects) that were not evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2030 General Plan.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have additional significant environmental effects.

SECTION V - DETERMINATION: States whether environmental effects associated with development of the proposed project are significant, and what, if any, added environmental documentation may be required.

REFERENCES CITED: Identifies source materials that have been consulted in the preparation of the Initial Study.

SECTION I. BACKGROUND

File Number, Project Name:

P06-134, Bruceville American Dream

Project Location:

The proposed project site is located on the west side of Bruceville Road at Damascas Drive. Jacinto Road is located north, Center Parkway is east and Sheldon Road is south. The project site includes Assessor's Parcel Numbers 117-0211-017, -018, -021, -027 and -028.

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

Project Applicant

Kent Baker
Baker-Williams Engineering Group
6020 Rutland Drive, Suite #19
Carmichael, CA 95608

Project Planner

Antonio Ablog, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 808-7702

Environmental Planner

Dana Allen, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 808-2762

This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 1500 *et seq.*). The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento.

The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR and is consistent with the land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site as set forth in the 2030 General Plan. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15176 (b) and (d).

The City has prepared the attached Initial Study to (a) review the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR to determine their adequacy for the project (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and (b) identify any potential new or additional project-specific significant environmental effects that were not analyzed in the Master EIR and any mitigation measures or alternatives that may avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance, if any.

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(d)) The Master EIR mitigation measures that are identified as appropriate are set forth in the applicable technical sections below.

This analysis incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the 2030 General Plan Master EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The Master EIR is available for public review at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, and on the City's web site at:

www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/.

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending January 14, 2011.

Please send written responses to:

Dana Allen, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 808-2762
dallen@cityofsacramento.org

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT SITE AND CHARACTERISTICS

The project site consists of approximately 6.9 acres. The site acreage is 4.7 net acres, which accounts for public street and other dedications required of the project.

The project site lies within Section 22, Township 7 North, and Range 5 East, in Section 22 of the Florin USGS 7.5 Quadrangle. The site is in the North Laguna area of South Sacramento, northwest of the intersection of Bruceville Road and Sheldon Road. The proposed project is centered at approximately 38° 26' 32.80" North latitude and 121° 25' 06.29" West longitude. The topography is slightly rolling to level throughout, and is approximately 23 feet above mean sea level. The Assessor Parcel Numbers are 117-0211-017, -018, -021, -027 and -028.

The proposed project is limited by Bruceville Road along the eastern boundary, residential uses along Clearbrook Way on the western boundary, the North Fork of Laguna Creek along the southern boundary, and residential construction along the northern boundary, south of Jacinto Avenue.

Based on the vegetation, soils, and hydrologic indicators the 0.32-acre (275 feet long X 50 feet wide) reach of Laguna Creek along the southern boundary qualifies as "other waters of the U.S." under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and as "waters of the State" under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game.

A Wetlands and Biological Resources Assessment was prepared in June 2008. The project site is located near five known occurrences of Swainson's hawk nesting within five miles. The project site provides marginal foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk and other raptors, but does not provide suitable habitat for any other special-status species. The project lies adjacent to Laguna Creek which provides potential habitat for giant garter snake. The Western pond turtle has been recorded in Laguna Creek west of the site.

An Environmental Noise Assessment was conducted for the site in November 2007. The primary noise sources in the project area would be traffic from Bruceville Road and future light rail operations.

Raney Geotechnical, Inc. prepared a Phase I Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed project site in November 2006. The EA found debris piles that did not reveal contaminated conditions, and two inoperative water wells onsite. No soil or water contamination was identified in the report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project requests entitlements to construct a 49-unit, small lot, single-family subdivision on approximately 4.7 net vacant acres within the Multi-Family (R-2B-PUD) zone. Specific entitlements include a Tentative Map to subdivide five parcels totaling approximately 6.9 acres into 49 small lot single family residential parcels and two landscape lots, a PUD Guideline Amendment to allow small lot single-family residences within the Laguna Meadows Planned Unit Development, a PUD Schematic Plan Amendment and a Special Permit for alternative housing.

All construction staging areas would be located on the project site.

A 40-foot irrevocable offer of dedication (IOD) is being reserved on the eastern boundary of the project site, in Lots A and B, for future light rail transportation purposes along Bruceville Road.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Vicinity Map

Attachment 2 – Site Plan

Attachment 3 – URBEMIS report

SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY

Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to examine the effects of a project on the physical conditions that exist within the area that would be affected by the project. CEQA also requires a discussion of any inconsistency between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

An inconsistency between the proposed project and an adopted plan for land use development in a community would not constitute a physical change in the environment. When a project diverges from an adopted plan, however, it may affect planning in the community regarding infrastructure and services, and the new demands generated by the project may result in later physical changes in response to the project.

In the same manner, the fact that a project brings new people or demand for housing to a community does not, by itself, change the physical conditions. An increase in population may, however, generate changes in retail demand or demand for governmental services, and the demand for housing may generate new activity in residential development. Physical environmental impacts that could result from implementing the proposed project are discussed in the appropriate technical sections.

This section of the initial study identifies the applicable land use designations, plans and policies, and permissible densities and intensities of use, and discusses any inconsistencies between these plans and the proposed project. This section also discusses agricultural resources and the effect of the project on these resources.

DISCUSSION

The project proposes to develop approximately 4.7 net acres into 49 small lots. The proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan designations for the site. The proposed project is located in an urbanized portion of the community, and includes connections to municipal water, sewer and storm drains. Extension of utilities to the project site would not extend service to an area not previously served.

The project site is currently vacant. The area surrounding the site consists of existing single-family residences. The proposed project is zoned R-2B-R-PUD (Multi-Family Zone-Plan Review-Planned Unit Development). The surrounding properties are zoned R-1 (Standard Single-Family Zone) to the north, R-1A PUD (Single-Family Alternative Zone-Planned Unit Development) to the east, A-PUD (Agriculture Zone-Planned Unit Development) to the south and R-1 PUD (Standard Single-Family Zone-Planned Unit Development) to the west.

R-2B is a multi-family residential zone that offers broader density flexibility as a transition for the garden apartment setting to a more traditional apartment setting. To ensure consistency with the adopted schematic plan and development guidelines for a PUD, a development project within the Laguna Creek PUD is subject to a Special Permit. The Planned Unit Development designation indicates that the property so classified is subject to the requirements and restrictions set forth in the indicated land use zone.

R-1 is a low density residential zone composed of single-family detached residences on lots a minimum of fifty-two (52) feet by one hundred (100) feet in size. A duplex or halfplex is allowed on a corner lot subject to compliance with specific restrictions. Approximate density for the R-1 zone is six

to eight dwelling units per acre. R-1A is a low to medium density residential zone intended to permit the establishment of single-family, individually owned, attached or detached residences where lot sizes, height, area and/or setback requirements vary from standard single-family. The Agriculture zone to the south of the project site encompasses the North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area Bike Trail (City of Sacramento, Parks and Recreation).

The land use designation for the City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan is Medium Density Residential 16-29 du/na.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<u>1. LIGHT AND GLARE</u> Would the proposal: A) Create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance?			X
B) Create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is not in an adopted view corridor or a scenic vista. The project site consists of approximately 4.7 net acres. The proposed project is limited by Bruceville Road along the eastern boundary, residential along Clearbrook Way on the western boundary, the North Fork of Laguna Creek along the southern boundary, and residential construction along the northern boundary, south of Jacinto Avenue.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, aesthetics impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

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

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the general plan policy area, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2030 general Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.13, Urban Design and Visual Resources.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for glare (Impact 6.13-1). Mitigation Measure 6.13-1, set forth below, was identified to reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.

Light cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses was identified as a potential impact (Impact 6.13-2). The Master EIR identified Policy LU 6.1.14 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses) and its requirement that lighting must be shielded and directed downward as reducing the potential effect to a less-than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO PROJECT

Master EIR Mitigation Measure 6.13-1: *The City shall amend the Zoning Code to prohibit new development from:*

- 1) using reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface and on the ground three floors;*
- 2) using mirrored glass;*
- 3) using black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building; and,*
- 4) using metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building.*

The Zoning Code has not yet been amended to include the restrictions identified in Mitigation Measure 6.13-1. The restrictions will be applied to the project, if applicable, to ensure that the potential impact identified in the Master EIR is less than significant.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

The proposed project includes construction of a residential development. Residential development is not typically considered to be a substantial source of glare, due to the limited height and the limited amount of reflective surface area (i.e., glass and metal surfaces). The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse affects associated with glare.

The proposed project would require improvements to the City rights-of-way. These improvements include the installation of street lighting, as required by the Department of Transportation as a condition of approval. The lighting would be installed and shielded consistent with City standards. With the design and orientation of lighting in compliance with the City standards, there would be no additional significant effects.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to light and glare.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
2. <u>AIR QUALITY</u>			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
A) Result in construction emissions of NO _x above 85 pounds per day?			X
B) Result in operational emissions of NO _x or ROG above 65 pounds per day?			X
C) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X
D) Result in PM ₁₀ concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard?			X
E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)?			X
F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
G) Result in TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources?			
H) Impede the City or state efforts to meet AB32 standards for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

In December 2006 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) revised the national ambient air quality standard for fine particle pollution to provide increased protection of public health and welfare. The revised standard is 35 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m³) for particles less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM_{2.5}), averaged over 24 hours. In December 2008 the EPA Administrator identified nonattainment areas, and in October 2009 confirmed the designations. Sacramento County is included on this list, along with portions of surrounding counties that contribute to the nonattainment conditions.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan MEIR:

- construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day;
- operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- PM₁₀ concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard. However, if project emissions of NO_x and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, then the project would not result in violations of the PM₁₀ ambient air quality standards;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm); or
- exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Ambient air quality standards have not been established for toxic air contaminants (TAC). TAC exposure is deemed to be significant if:

- TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 6.1.

Policies in the 2030 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.12 requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure that the projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the 2030 general Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include ER 6.1.5, requiring consideration of current guidance provided by the Air Resources Board and SMAQMD; requiring development adjacent to stationary or mobile TAC sources to be designed with consideration of such exposure in design, landscaping and filters; as well as Policies ER 6.11.1 and ER 6.11.15, referred to above.

The Master EIR found that greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2030 General Plan would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150)

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2030 General Plan that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. See Draft MEIR, Chapter 8, and pages 8-49 et seq. The Master EIR is available for review at the offices of Development Services Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA during normal business hours, and is also available online at

<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/>.

Policies identified in the 2030 General Plan include directives relating to sustainable development patterns and practices, and increasing the viability of pedestrian, bicycle and public transit modes. A complete list of policies addressing climate change is included in the Master EIR in Table 8-5, pages 8-50 et seq; the Final MEIR included additional discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in response to written comments. See changes to Chapter 8 at Final MEIR pages 2-19 et seq. See also Letter 2 and response.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

The following mitigation measures applicable to air quality were identified in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR, and will be applied to the project:

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change: The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2030 General Plan that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. See Draft MEIR, Chapter 8, and pages 8-49 et seq. The Master EIR is available for review at the offices of Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA during normal business hours, and is also available online at

<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/>.

Policies identified in the 2030 General Plan include directives relating to sustainable development patterns and practices, and increasing the viability of pedestrian, bicycle and public transit modes. A complete list of policies addressing climate change is included in the Master EIR in Table 8-5, pages 8-50 et seq; the Final MEIR included additional discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in response to written comments. See changes to Chapter 8 at Final MEIR pages 2-19 et seq. See also Letter 2 and response.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

Project-Related Construction Impacts: The URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 model was used to calculate estimated emissions for the construction of the proposed project. Based on the estimated emissions from running the URBEMIS model, the proposed project is not likely to exceed the short-term emissions threshold of 85 lbs/day for NO_x. Estimated NO_x summer emissions using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 model were calculated to be approximately 66.96 lbs/day, which is below the 85 lbs/day threshold.

The SMAQMD 2004 Guide to Air Quality Assessment states on page 3-2 that if the project's NO_x mass emissions from heavy-duty, mobile sources is determined not potentially significant using the recommended methodologies for estimating emissions (Manual Calculation, URBEMIS, and Roadway Construction Model), the Lead Agency may assume that exhaust emissions of other pollutants from operation of construction equipment and worker commute vehicles are also not significant. The

URBEMIS 2007 model indicated that the project would not exceed the NO_x threshold and, based on the guidance of the air district, the analysis of other criteria pollutant emissions is not included in this discussion.

Construction activities would be subject to with SMAQMD's Rule 403 on Fugitive Dust, which provides that contractors shall take every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates, from any construction, handling or storage activity, or any excavation, grading, clearing of land or solid waste disposal operation. Reasonable precautions include, but are not limited to:

- the use of water or chemicals for control of dust, where possible, during construction operations (including roadways), or during the clearing of land;
- the application of asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, materials stockpiles, and other surfaces, which can give rise to airborne dusts;
- other means approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the air quality standards as established by SMAQMD, and would result in a **less than significant** impact to air quality.

Operational Impacts: The URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 model was used to calculate estimated emissions for the operation of the proposed project. Estimated ROG and NO_x summer emissions for using the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 model were calculated to be approximately 3.83 lbs/day and 3.68 lbs/day, respectively, which is below the 65 lbs/day threshold.

QUESTIONS C AND D

The proposed project involves the construction of 49 residential units. The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Sacramento County is considered a nonattainment area for fine particle pollution. However, the project emissions of NO_x and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, therefore the project would not result in violations of the PM₁₀ ambient air quality standards.

QUESTION E

The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO since traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in deterioration of intersection level of service (LOS) to LOS E or F and would not contribute to additional traffic at an intersection that already operates at LOS E or F (see Transportation Section).

QUESTION F

Land uses such as schools, hospitals, residences and convalescent homes are considered to be especially sensitive to poor air quality. However, since proposed project emissions of NO_x, ROG, PM₁₀ and CO are anticipated to be less than significant, it is not expected that concentrations would exceed any standards for sensitive receptors. The proposed project is not located in close proximity to a freeway or major roadway, and there would be no project-specific impacts relating to exposure to toxic air contaminants.

QUESTION G

Land uses such as schools, hospitals, residences and convalescent homes are considered to be especially sensitive to poor air quality associated with TAC. The most prominent TAC associated with

high volumes of traffic on major roadways is diesel PM. The Project Site is adjacent to Bruceville Road, which is a four-lane arterial road that runs north to south from Valley Hi Drive to Desmond Road. Traffic volume on Bruceville Road is 18,000 ADT in 2003. 18,000 ADT is well below the SMAQMD's Protocol of 100,000 vehicles per day on an urban roadway. The Project Site is not located within 500 feet from the edge of travel lane for Highway 99; therefore, DPM from Highway 99 would not affect the sensitive receptors located at the project site.

QUESTION H

The project will comply with the 2030 General Plan's numerous policies that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. No project-specific effects regarding greenhouse gas emissions would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Air Quality.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
3. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> Would the proposal: A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected			X
B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal		X	
C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following discussion includes information set forth in the wetlands and arborist reports identified in the references, below.

Information included in this section relating to the characteristics of the project site, habitat and species that could be affected by the project, mitigation measures and related projects, is contained in several reports and public documents, including the following:

- Wetlands and Biological Resource Assessment for the project site, Bruce D. Barnett, Ph.D., June 3, 2008;
- North Laguna Creek Wildlife Bike Trail Project, *Draft Low Effect Habitat Conservation Plan*, City of Sacramento, September 2005;
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Programmatic Formal Consultation for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permitted Projects with Relatively Small Effects on Giant Garter Snake within Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter and Yolo Counties, California, November 13, 1997

Site Description

The project site is located on the west side of Bruceville Road in south Sacramento, immediately north of the north fork of Laguna Creek. The topography of the entire project site is slightly rolling to level. Recent discing for weed abatement and fire protection has eliminated much of the standing vegetative cover. Ruderal (weedy) vegetation and remnant trees associated with a former homestead exist in the north-central portion of the proposed project site. There are no structures or hardscape surfaces on the proposed project site.

Laguna Creek is in the Morrison Creek watershed. Laguna Creek drains 48 square miles of the 192-acre Morrison Creek Stream group watershed. Laguna Creek drains westward from the rolling foothills of the eastern watershed boundary to its confluence with Morrison Creek near Beach Lake, which is part of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. The North Fork of Laguna Creek (NFLC), immediately north of the project site, has been channelized as part of the Laguna Creek Floodway improvements project, and was part of a larger floodway improvements project by the City.

The City prepared a wetland mitigation plan as part of the channelization of the NFLC. The NFLC was delineated and was referred to in the mitigation plan for the overall project as “seasonal marsh #13.” The marsh and the NFLC were substantially modified as part of the floodway project. The seasonal marsh on the north and south sides of the NFLC was converted into a vernal pool/wetland mitigation area. The proposed project is located adjacent to mitigation wetlands south of the NFLC channel.

As part of the Floodway project, the NFLC was straightened and levees were constructed along the north and south banks to provide 100-year flood protection to the adjacent lands. The Mitigation Wetland was monitored in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit conditions. The five-year monitoring program was completed in 1995 after the Corps concurred that the Mitigation Wetland had met the established success criteria. (HCP, p. 4-1)

Special-Status Species

Special-status species are plants and animals that, because of their recognized rarity or vulnerability to various causes of habitat loss or population decline, are recognized in some fashion by federal, state, or other agencies as deserving special consideration.

According to results from the California Department of Fish and Game’s California Natural Diversity Database, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Native Plant Society queries for the Florin, Sacramento East, Carmichael, Clarksburg, Courtland, Sacramento West, Elk Grove, Bruceville, and Galt quads, there are a total of 49 recorded occurrences of special-status plant, wildlife, and natural community types present within a 5-mile radius of the proposed site; fourteen plant species and twenty-eight wildlife species. The special-status species that could be supported by the habitat present at the proposed project are discussed below.

Increasing development of the surrounding landscape has removed significant areas of open habitat once associated with rural landscapes outside the urban fringe, resulting in reduced nesting, foraging, and cover opportunities for local wildlife species. The proposed project is located within the known range of Swainson’s hawk with the nearest known occurrence of Swainson’s hawk nesting approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the project site. The open grassland habitat of the proposed project site could provide potentially suitable foraging habitat.

The Western pond turtle has been recorded in Laguna Creek west of the proposed project site and may be present within the creek at the south end of the proposed site.

Giant garter snakes generally inhabit marshland areas supported by perennial fresh water and low-gradient streams, but will also inhabit temporary water such as sloughs, irrigation canals, drainage ditches, and flooded rice fields. The Giant garter snake habitat is typically devoid of a dense tree canopy and contains various annual and perennial grasses. The Laguna Creek watershed (west of Highway 99) supports a portion of the south Sacramento County giant garter snake population, which is made up of several small, disjunct sub-populations generally occurring in disturbed habitats within a surrounding rapidly urbanizing area.

Heritage Trees

Chapter 12.56 of the City of Sacramento Code protects City trees and Chapter 12.64 of the City Code protects heritage trees. The arborist report confirms that there are no heritage or City trees on the project site.

Jurisdictional Waters

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers defines wetlands as those areas: (1) dominated by hydrophytic plant species (i.e., species adapted to growing in wetlands); (2) exhibiting hydric soils (i.e., soils that are characterized by reduced conditions); and (3) exhibiting characteristic hydrologic indicators (i.e., evidence of short or long-term soil saturation or inundation). If all three parameters (vegetation, soils, and hydrology) are met by an area, the wetland would be regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Based on the vegetation, soils, and hydrologic indicators present on the property, the 0.32-acre of Laguna Creek (275 feet long X 50 feet wide = 13,750 square feet) along the southern boundary of the proposed project qualifies as “other waters of the U.S.” under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and as “waters of the State” under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game under Sections 1600-1607 of the California Department Fish and Game Code.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Chapter 6.3 of the Master EIR evaluated the effects of the 2030 General Plan on biological resources

within the general plan policy area. The Master EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the 2030 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2030 General Plan. Policy 2.1.5 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate; and Policy 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the California Department Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

The Master EIR concluded that the cumulative effects of development that could occur under the 2030 General Plan would be significant and unavoidable as they related to effects on special-status plant species (Impact 6.3-2), reduction of habitat for special-status invertebrates (Impact 6.3-3), loss of habitat for special-status birds (Impact 6.3-4), loss of habitat for special-status amphibians and reptiles (Impact 6.3-5), loss of habitat for special-status mammals (Impact 6.5-6), special-status fish (Impact 6.3-7) and, in general, loss of riparian habitat, wetlands and sensitive natural communities such as elderberry savannah (Impacts 6.3-8 through 10).

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

Implementation of 2030 General Plan Policy ER 2.1.10 in the Environmental Resources section would require protocol-level or industry-recognized surveys prior to site construction. If special-status bird species are using the site, project applicants would be required to assume presence and prepare survey reports to be submitted to the City and CDFG or USFWS for development of avoidance and/or specific mitigation measures. This mitigation would likely include nesting season avoidance or passive relocation of the birds (in the case of burrowing owls) and preservation of suitable nesting and foraging habitat outside of the Policy Area.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

The residential land use proposed would not create a potential health hazard, or use, produce or dispose of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected.

QUESTION B

Swainson's hawk

The proposed project is located within the known range of Swainson's hawk, which is fully protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and is a California threatened species. Swainson's hawks are open-country birds that forage in large, open grasslands and agricultural fields as much as 10 miles from their nest, but nests are generally more successful if suitable foraging habitat is present within an approximate 5-mile radius.

The proposed project site provides foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. The project would develop the site with housing and associated infrastructure, including roadways. The site as developed would not provide foraging habitat, and the project would result in a loss of 6.9 acres of foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk.

The California Department of Fish and Game recommends mitigation for loss of suitable foraging

habitat at a ratio of 1:1 (mitigation acreage: habitat loss acreage). The City accepts the recommendation from the Department as the legislatively-identified trustee of the state's biological resources (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15386, Fish and Game Code, Section 1802).

Development and construction activities involve increased human activity and increase noise levels. During the nesting season, approximately March 1 through September 15, these activities within 500 feet of an active nest can cause nest abandonment or premature fledging of the young. Construction activities on the project site could adversely impact nesting or migratory birds occurring adjacent to the proposed project site. Construction of the project could result in a significant impact to nesting Swainson's hawk without the implementation of mitigation measures. A significant impact would occur if construction activities result in the destruction of an active Swainson's hawk nest, nest abandonment or forced fledging.

Giant garter snake

The project site lies adjacent to Laguna Creek, which provides potential habitat for Giant garter snake (GGS), which is both a state and federally threatened species. The USFWS may view the proposed project as potentially impacting upland buffer habitat for this species, resulting in "take" of GGS or its habitat given the site's suitability and connectivity to historical populations.

In the *Programmatic Formal Consultation for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permitted Projects with Relatively Small Effects on the Giant Garter Snake with Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter and Yolo Counties, California*, the USFWS incorporated a standard of 200 feet of upland on each bank side of linear habitat as suitable upland for GGS when assessing a project's disturbance area. The 200-foot upland buffer has become standard in subsequent biological opinions and impact analyses. By this standard all components of the proposed project falling within 200 feet of the channel edge will constitute either temporary or permanent impacts to GGS or its habitat.

Portions of the project fall within the 200-foot buffer area as identified by the USFWS. Project improvements in this area would permanently reduce the habitat available for GGS; construction activities in this area could result in the "take" of GGS, which would require either conditions as part of a federal permit (for example, a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) or an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) and habitat conservation plan (HCP) pursuant to Section 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act. Loss of habitat and potential take of GGS are significant impacts.

Mitigation is typically based on the nature and duration of the impact. *Temporary impacts* of the project include those activities that temporarily remove essential habitat components, but which can be restored to pre-project conditions with equal or greater habitat values. Impacts will be considered temporary only if the project can restore the affected habitat within two seasons. A season is defined as the calendar year period between May 1 and October 1. Temporary impacts to upland habitat would be minimal. Construction staging for the project would occur in areas that would eventually be the site of homes and roadways, and impacts for these areas are considered below under permanent loss of habitat and mitigation measure Bio 3.

Permanent loss of habitat. Construction of the project would result in the *permanent loss of upland habitat*, and would be considered a "Level 3" impact by USFWS. Required mitigation for the permanent loss of habitat is set forth in Mitigation Measure Bio 3, set forth below. Mitigation through habitat replacement as set forth in the mitigation measure would reduce the impact for loss of GGS habitat to a less-than-significant level.

Potential take of species. Construction of the project could result in the "take" of Giant garter snakes. The GGS is reasonably certain to occur in the project area because of recent occurrences of the GGS

in the project vicinity, suitable upland and aquatic habitat within and adjacent to the project site, the animal's ability to move substantial distances in short periods of time, and the lack of obvious natural barriers that would prevent their movement into the project area. Any "take" resulting from project construction would be a significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures Bio 3 and Bio 4, inclusive, would reduce the project-specific impact of the project to a *less-than-significant* level.

Burrowing Owl

Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of active burrowing owl nest burrows. The California Department of Fish and Game conducted a CNDDDB review of the proposed project site and found a high potential for the burrowing owl to establish nests within the site if burrows become established on site before the on-set of development activities. The mitigation identified below would reduce the burrowing owl impact to a less than significant level.

Western pond turtle

The portion of Laguna Creek along the project site's southern boundary could provide appropriate aquatic (and basking) habitat for the Western pond turtle, however, the area disturbed by project construction activities will not encroach into the area identified as suitable habitat for Western pond turtle.

The project would have a less than significant impact on endangered, threatened or rare species with the incorporation of the mitigation measures listed below.

QUESTION C

No water features such as vernal pools, marshes, seasonal wetlands are located on or adjacent to, the site. However, 0.32-acre of Laguna Creek (275 feet long X 50 feet wide = 13, 750 square feet) is located along the southern boundary of the proposed project qualifies as "other waters of the U.S." under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and as "waters of the State" under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game under Sections 1600-1607 of the California Department Fish and Game Code.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure Biology 6 would ensure a less than significant impact to wetland habitats.

QUESTION D

Because the project site is 6.9 acres and is surrounded on all sides by development, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The proposed project is located adjacent to the North Laguna Creek Bike Trail. Construction of the proposed project will be located outside of the bike trail boundaries. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Biology 1: To mitigate impacts to Swainson's hawk and other migratory birds during the nesting

season (March 1 through September 15), the project applicant(s) shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project site. The surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days before the beginning of construction. To the extent feasible, guidelines provided in Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's hawk Nesting Surveys in the Central Valley (Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000) shall be followed.

If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.

If active nests are found, impacts to nesting Swainson's hawks and other migratory birds shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers around the nests to the extent any portion of the buffer area is located on the project site. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that any young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. DFG guidelines recommend implementation of 0.25-mile buffers for most birds and 0.5-mile buffers for Swainson's hawk, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the City, in consultation with DFG, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. If adjustments to this buffer are made, Fish and Game Code Section 2081 permits may need to be obtained through DFG. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities will be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. Initiation of construction before March 1 or after September 15 does not require a survey to be conducted, and mitigation is not required.

Biology 2: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall preserve 6.9 acres of suitable raptor foraging habitat for the loss of habitat. Suitable foraging habitat includes alfalfa or other low growing row crops. Preservation may occur through the purchase of conservation easements or fee title of lands with suitable foraging habitat. Land and easements shall be approved by the City in consultation with DFG.

Biology 3: Giant garter snake permanent loss of habitat: The area to be considered as permanent loss of habitat shall be the area set back from the edge of the Laguna Creek channel, upland 200 feet, excluding land area covered by the City of Sacramento's North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area Bike Trail. The applicant shall, prior to obtaining a grading permit, submit written confirmation that it has complied with all applicable requirements of the Programmatic Formal Consultation dated November 13, 1997 and shall submit an approved conservation easement from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service clearly identifying the land area subject to permanent loss of habitat, and demonstrating that replacement habitat for the Giant garter snake has been obtained, and that all elements of the mitigation set forth below have been adequately secured:

- A. The conservation easement shall indicate that it is replacement of affected giant garter snake upland habitat at a 3:1 ratio, and shall identify the land area affected and the total land area covered by the conservation easement;
- B. If restoration of habitat is a component of the replacement habitat, the applicant shall provide to the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department and the USFWS one year of monitoring restored habitat with a photo documentation report, which shall be due one year from implementation of the restoration with pre- and post-project area photos, and five years of monitoring replacement habitat with photo documentation report due each year.

Biology 4: Giant garter snake potential take: Prior to obtaining a grading permit, the applicant shall submit to the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department and USFWS an approved incidental take permit for Giant garter snake from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The following are the typical Terms and Conditions of an approved HCP:

- a. Prior to commencement of construction activities the applicant shall compensate for the permanent loss of habitat of the Giant garter snake to the satisfaction of the USFWS, as specified in Bio 3.
- b. Construction activity within snake habitat shall be conducted between May 1 and October 1, the active period for the Giant garter snake;
- c. The applicant shall identify any land area of the project site that should be avoided as an environmentally sensitive area (ESA). Prior to commencement of construction, high visibility fencing shall be erected around such areas to protect them from encroachment of personnel or equipment. The fencing shall be inspected prior to the start of each workday and maintained by the applicant until completion of construction. Signs shall be posted every 50 feet along the edge of ESAs, with the following text:

“This area is habitat of federally-threatened and/or endangered species, and must not be disturbed. These species are protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines and imprisonment.”

- The signs shall be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet, and shall be maintained until completion of construction, when they shall be removed.
- d. Best Management Practices (BMPs), including a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Pollution Control program (WPCP) shall be implemented to prevent sediment from entering areas outside the project area or construction area, including, e.g., silt fencing, temporary berms, and installation of vegetative strips. BMPs shall be implemented to reduce impacts from erosion, dust, noise and other deleterious aspects of construction activities. Runoff from dust control and hazardous materials shall be retained on the construction site.
 - e. Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control and other purposes at the project site to ensure that the Giant garter snake does not get trapped or become entangled. This restriction shall be communicated to the contractor through the use of special provisions included in the bid solicitation package. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) shall not be used for erosion control.
 - f. During construction operations, the number of access routes, number and size of staging areas, and the total area of the proposed project activity shall be limited to the proposed project site. Routes and boundaries will be restricted to established roadways to minimize habitat disturbance. Project-related vehicles shall observe a 20-mile per hour limit within construction areas, except on paved public highways.
 - g. During construction operations, stockpiling of construction materials, portable equipment, vehicles and supplies shall be restricted to any designated construction staging areas and shall avoid all environmentally sensitive areas. The applicant shall ensure that there is no contamination of habitat areas during construction operations.
 - h. Within 24 hours prior to the commencement of construction activities, the applicant shall arrange for a site visit and inspection by a USFWS-approved biologist. The biologist shall be on-site during all activities that could result in adverse effects to the GGS. The monitoring biologist shall have the authority to stop construction activities if a snake is encountered until appropriate corrective measures as identified by the biologist have been implemented, or until the snake is determined to be unharmed. Snakes encountered during construction activities shall be allowed to move away from the area on their own volition. The biologist shall notify the USFWS immediately if any listed species are found on-site, and shall submit a report regarding each such sighting, including date and time, location, habitat description, and any corrective measures taken for protection of the species. The biologist shall report any take of listed species to the USFWS immediately by telephone at (916) 414-6000 and by electronic mail or written letter addressed to the Chief, Endangered Species Division, within three (3) working days of the incident.

- i. A Worker Environmental Awareness Training Program for all construction personnel shall be conducted by the USFWS-approved biologist prior to the commencement of construction activities. The program shall provide workers with information on their responsibilities with regard to the snake, an overview of the life-history of the species, information on take prohibitions, protections afforded the animal under the federal Endangered Species Act, and an explanation of the relevant terms and conditions of the various biological opinions that have been issued by the USFWS relating to the Giant garter snake. All workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and appropriate measures that should be taken in the event a spill occurs.
- j. To eliminate an attraction to predators of the snake, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles and food scraps shall be disposed of in closed containers and removed at the end of each workday from the project site.
- k. Any dewatered habitat shall remain dry for at least 15 consecutive days after April 15.
- l. After construction activities are complete, any temporary fill or construction debris shall be removed. Disturbed areas that are not developed with permanent project improvements shall be restored to their pre-project conditions. All snake habitat areas subject to temporary ground disturbances, including storage or staging areas and temporary roadways or paths, shall be restored. Such areas shall be re-contoured, if appropriate, and re-vegetated with appropriate locally-collected native plant species to promote restoration to pre-project conditions. Refer to USFWS *Guidelines for the Restoration and/or Replacement of Giant Garter Snake Habitat (USFWS 1997)*. A written report regarding restoration and project site conditions shall be submitted to the USFWS and City of Sacramento Development Services Department, Attention Mitigation Monitoring, within ten working days of the completion of construction at the project site.

Biology 5: Prior to the issuance of grading permits or any ground disturbing activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction burrowing owl survey. The survey shall be conducted in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the California Burrowing Owl Consortium's April 1993 Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, and shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to ground disturbing activity.

If no suitable burrows are found, no further mitigation is required. If suitable burrows are found, but no owls are found, all burrows shall be hand-excavated and collapsed prior to any ground disturbing activity. If nesting owls are found, buffers shall be established and no disturbance shall be allowed within 160-feet of the active nest burrow during the nesting season (i.e., between February 1 and August 21).

Outside the nesting season, and/or upon confirmation by the qualified biologist, in consultation with CDFG, that all young have fledged and left an active nest, burrowing owls present in the burrow shall be excluded from the burrow(s) by a qualified biologist through a passive relocation as outlined in the California Burrowing Owl Consortium's April 1993 Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines. Once the burrows have been cleared, they shall be hand-excavated and collapsed prior to ground disturbing activity.

Biology 6: In order to ensure no impacts to bed, bank or channel of Laguna Creek, the project applicant shall establish a minimum 50-foot setback from the creek and utilize best management practices during construction, including but not limited to the installation and maintenance of silt fencing at the 50 foot setback. If the proposed project affects the bed, bank, or channel of the feature, permitting from the Army Corp of Engineers shall be required under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Permitting from the California Department of Fish and Game under Sections 1600-1607 of the California Fish and Game Code shall be required in such event.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Biological Resources can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>4. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> Would the project:</p> <p>A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?</p>		X	
<p>B) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project is not located in an area with protected city landmarks, according to the 2030 General Plan MEIR, Figure 6.4-2, Historic Structures. The proposed project is located near an area considered to have Moderate Archaeological Sensitivity, as identified by the 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report, Figure 6.4-1, Archaeological Sensitivity Map. The MEIR defines a Primary Impact Area as an area that is most sensitive to urban development due to the potential presence of cultural resources. These areas include areas along the Sacramento and American Rivers, North Natomas, portions of North Sacramento which lie north of I-80 along drainage courses, the American River floodplain, the southwest portion of South Natomas, the Florin Road vicinity, the southeast portion of south Sacramento, and the unsurveyed drainage ditches of Fruitridge Broadway.

The Phase 1 environmental assessment of the project site revealed there were two former on-site rural farm residences located near Damascas Drive. They are assumed to have been demolished in the early 1980s. The Phase 1 historical review of the site suggests that in addition to the former rural farm residences, the property supported agricultural activities consisting primarily of dry crops and grazing land.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, cultural resource impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or
 2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- Answers to Checklist Questions

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2030 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources. See Chapter 6.4. The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historic resources and archaeological resources.

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.15), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10 and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.13). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort. (Policy HCR 1.1.14)

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

No feasible mitigation measures beyond what the 2030 General Plan policies require are available to ensure that no archaeological resources are damaged or destroyed.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

The project site consists of disturbed land, and does not contain any known cultural or historical resources. However, during construction, previously unidentified cultural or historical resources may be unearthed. The mitigation measures listed below shall be implemented to ensure a less-than-significant impact to potential cultural resources.

QUESTION B

The General Plan Policy Area is not considered sensitive for paleontological resources and the likelihood of finding something would be very low. However, ground-disturbing activities could affect the integrity of paleontological site, thereby causing a substantial change in the significance of the resource. Implementation of the General Plan Policy HCR 2.1.15 ensures that the City will protect paleontological resources in compliance with accepted protocols.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Cultural Resources 1

- a. The applicant shall hire a qualified archaeologist to conduct a records search for the project site, including a search of the North Central Information System at CSU Sacramento. The archaeologist shall provide recommendations for mitigation should any resource be identified on the project site by the records search. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall provide proof that the records search has been performed and that any cultural resources identified on the project site have been mitigated according to the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist.
- b. In the event that any prehistoric subsurface archeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("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 archeologist shall coordinate to determine the 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.

- c. If a Native American site is discovered, the evaluation process shall include consultation with the appropriate Native American representatives.
 - o If Native American archeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archeologists, 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.
 - o 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 involved, all identified treatment is to be carried out by qualified historical archeologists, who shall meet either Register of Professional Archeologists (RPA), or 36 CFR 61 requirements.
- d. If a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity 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 find until the identified appropriate actions have taken place.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Cultural Resources can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>5. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project allow a project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Seismicity. The 2030 General Plan Master EIR identifies all the City of Sacramento as being subject to potential damage from earthquake ground shaking at a maximum intensity of VIII of the Modified Mercalli scale (Master EIR, page 6.5-6). No active or potentially active faults are known to cross within close proximity to the project site.

Topography. Terrain of the proposed site is relatively flat. The elevation of the proposed project is approximately 23 feet above sea level.

Geology. The surface geology of the project site consists of Quaternary alluvium. Quaternary alluvium consists of gravel, sand, silt and clay deposited by present day stream and river systems.

Soils. According to the Soils Survey of Sacramento County prepared by the US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Services, the project site is underlain with Galt clay, Madera loam and San Joaquin Silt loam. The Galt clay is moderately deep with moderately well-drained soils and is located on basins on low terraces. Permeability is slow, runoff is very slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The Madera loam is moderately deep with moderately well drained soil and is located in low areas on low terraces commonly adjacent to the flood plains. Permeability is very slow, runoff is slow, and the hazard for erosion is slight. The San Joaquin Silt loam is moderately deep with moderately well drained soil and is located on low terraces. Permeability is very slow, runoff is slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Chapter 6.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the general plan policy area. Implementation of identified policies in the 2030 General Plan reduced all effects to a less-than-significant level. Policies EC 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 require regular review of the City’s seismic and geologic safety standards, geotechnical investigations for project sites and retrofit of critical facilities such as hospitals and schools.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None Applicable.

ANSWER TO CHECKLIST QUESTION

Because no active or potentially active faults are known in the project area, the proposed project would not be subject to hazards due to the rupture of a known earthquake fault.

The Master EIR determined that an earthquake of Intensity VII on the Modified Mercalli Scale is a potential event due to the seismicity of the region. Such an event would cause alarm and moderate structural damage could be expected. People and property on the site could be subject to seismic hazards, such as groundshaking, liquefaction, and settlement, which could result in damage or failure of components of the proposed project. This seismic activity could disrupt utility service due to damage or destruction of infrastructure, resulting in unsanitary or unhealthful conditions or possible fires or explosion from damaged natural gas lines.

The City is located in Zone 3 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) Seismic Risk Map. The City requires that all new structures be designed and constructed consistent with the UBC's Zone 3 requirements. Compliance with the California Uniform Building Code (CUBC) (Title 24) would minimize the potential for adverse effects on people and property due to seismic activity by requiring the use of earthquake protection standards in construction.

Implementation of applicable regulations, codes, and standard engineering practices would mitigate significant constraints on development of the proposed project site related to groundshaking or secondary seismic hazards. The impacts due to seismic activity would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Geology and Soils.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
7. HAZARDS Would the project: A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?		X	
B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?			X
C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

The project site is currently vacant. The area surrounding the proposed project consists of fallow land and single-family residences.

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with these regulations respecting asbestos may result in a Notice of Violation being issued by the AQMD and civil penalties under state and/or federal law, in addition to possible action by U.S. EPA under federal law.

Federal law covers a number of different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (40 CFR § 61.145).

SMAQMD Rule 902 and Commercial Structures

The work practices and administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to all commercial renovations and demolitions where the amount of Regulated Asbestos-Containing Material (RACM) is greater than:

- 260 lineal feet of RACM on pipes, or
- 160 square feet of RACM on other facility components, or
- 35 cubic feet of RACM that could not be measured otherwise.

The administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to any demolition of commercial structures, regardless of the amount of RACM.

Asbestos Surveys

To determine the amount of RACM in a structure, Rule 902 requires that a survey be conducted prior to demolition or renovation unless:

- the structure is otherwise exempt from the rule, or
- any material that has a propensity to contain asbestos (so-called "suspect material") is treated as if it is RACM.

Surveys must be done by a licensed asbestos consultant and require laboratory analysis. Asbestos consultants are listed in the phone book under "Asbestos Consultants." Large industrial facilities may use non-licensed employees if those employees are trained by the U.S. EPA. Questions regarding the use of non-licensed employees should be directed to the AQMD.

Removal Practices, Removal Plans/Notification and Disposal

If the survey shows that there are asbestos-containing materials present, the SMAQMD recommends leaving it in place.

If it is necessary to disturb the asbestos as part of a renovation, remodel, repair or demolition, Cal OSHA and the Contractors State License Board require a licensed asbestos abatement contractor be used to remove the asbestos-containing material.

There are specific disposal requirements in Rule 902 for friable asbestos-containing material, including disposal at a licensed landfill. If the material is non-friable asbestos, any landfill willing to accept asbestos-containing material may be used to dispose of the material.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities;
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials; or
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 6.6. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities, and exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the General Plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2030 general Plan, including PHS 3.1.1 (investigation of sites for contamination) and PHS 3.1.2 (preparation of hazardous materials actions plans when appropriate) were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None Applicable

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A THROUGH C

Raney Geotechnical, Inc. completed a Phase I Environmental Assessment (EA) of the proposed project in October 2006. Vegetation and demolition debris from two former on-site rural farm residences suggests previous agricultural activities consisting primarily of dry crops and grazing land. In 1989, Raney Geotechnical, Inc. performed a *Pre-acquisition Site Assessment* of a larger area of land of which the subject property is a part. The 1989 assessment included surface soil sampling for pesticides on the larger area of land westerly of the subject property. The analytical results did not reveal concentrations of pesticides above laboratory reporting limits. The study concluded that no further environmental study of the property was warranted.

During the October 2006 reconnaissance of the subject property, three large piles of demolition debris near the northern margin of the subject site were observed. The debris piles revealed building materials consisting of wood, drywall, roofing, piping metals and concrete. In 1992, Raney Geotechnical, Inc. collected samples of suspect asbestos containing building materials from the demolition debris, however, there was not laboratory analysis performed on the samples. Two inoperative water wells exist within the former rural farm residential areas.

The EA did not identify contamination of groundwater at the project site. Additionally, groundwater is noted to be 130 feet in depth. Therefore, the project will not expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to any contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities .

Mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project to reduce impacts hazards to the public or environment from the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Hazards 1

- a. Laboratory analysis of all debris removed from the site for asbestos shall be required prior to landfill acceptance.
- b. Existing water wells shall, if removed from service, be properly abandoned in accordance with the County of Sacramento, Environmental Management Department, Water Protection Division regulations. If the wells have previously been abandoned, verification from the County of Sacramento, Environmental Management Department, Water Protection Division shall be required as a condition of approval prior to grading permits from the City of Sacramento.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Hazards can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>8. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> Would the project:</p> <p>A) Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the project?</p>			X
<p>B) Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Drainage/Surface Water. The project site is located within drainage shed G273 and is in Watershed 2 of the Jacinto Creek Planning Area. The proposed project gravity flows directly to Laguna Creek.

Water Quality. The City’s municipal water is received from the American River and Sacramento River. The water of the American River is considered to be of very good quality. The Sacramento River water is considered to be of good quality, although higher sediment loads and extensive irrigated agriculture upstream of Sacramento tends to degrade the water quality. During the spring and fall, irrigation tail waters are discharged into drainage canals that flow to the river. In the winter, runoff flows over these same areas. In both instances, flows are highly turbid and introduce large amounts of herbicides and pesticides into the drainage canals, particularly rice field herbicides in May and June. The aesthetic quality of the river is changed from relatively clear to turbid from irrigation discharges.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has primary responsibility for protecting the quality of surface and groundwater within the City. The RWQCB’s efforts are generally focused on preventing the introduction of the new pollutants into bodies of water that fall under its jurisdiction.

The RWQCB is concerned with all potential sources of contamination that may reach both these subsurface water supplies and the rivers through direct surface runoff or infiltration. Storm water runoff is collected in City drainage facilities and is sent directly to the Sacramento River. The RWQCB implements water quality standards and objectives that are in keeping with the State of California Standards.

The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board under the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in storm runoff. The general permit requires the permittee to employ Best Management Practices (BMP’s) before, during, and after construction. The primary objective of the

BMP's is to reduce non-point source pollution into waterways. These practices include structural and source control measures for residential areas and BMP's for construction sites. BMP mechanisms minimize erosion and sedimentation, and prevent pollutants such as grease from entering the storm water drains. BMP's are approved by Department of Utilities before beginning conduction (the BMP document is available from the Department of Utilities, Engineering Services Division, 1395 35th Avenue, Sacramento, CA). Components of BMP's include:

- maintenance of structures and roads;
- flood control management;
- comprehensive development plans;
- grading, erosion and sediment control measures;
- inspection and enforcement procedures;
- reduction of pesticide use; and
- site-specific structural and non-structural control measures.

Flooding. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map revised as of February 18, 2005 indicates that the project site is within the Flood Zone X. The flood zone identifies areas of 500-year flood and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood. Within the X zone, there are no requirements to elevate or flood proof structures.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to hydrology and water quality may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan MEIR:

- substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan or
- substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Chapter 6.7 of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts 6.7-1, 6.7-2), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 6.7-3, 6.7-4). Policies included in the 2030 General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation (Policies ER 1.1.2, EC 2.1.1, EC 2.1.1), comprehensive flood management (Policy EC 2.1.14), and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Policy U 4.1.1) were identified that reduced all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

Policy ER 1.1.3: **Stormwater Quality.** The City shall control sources of pollutants and improve and maintain urban runoff water quality through stormwater protection measures consistent with the city's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.

Policy ER 1.1.4: **New Development.** The City shall require new development to protect the quality of water bodies and natural drainage systems through site design, source controls, storm water treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices (BMPs) and Low Impact Development (LID), and hydromodification strategies consistent with the city's NPDES Permit.

Policy ER 1.1.7: **Construction Site Impacts.** The shall minimize disturbances of natural water bodies and natural drainage systems caused by development, implement measure to protect areas from erosion and sediment loss, and continue to require construction contractors to comply with the City's erosion and sediment control ordinance and stormwater management and discharge control ordinance.

Policy U 4.1.4: **Watershed Drainage Plans.** The City shall require developers to prepare watershed drainage plans for proposed developments that define needed drainage improvements per City standards, estimate construction costs for these improvements, and comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

During construction, the applicant/developer would be required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Title 15). This ordinance requires the applicant to prepare erosion and sediment control plans for both during and post construction of the proposed project, prepare preliminary and final grading plans, and prepare plans to control urban runoff pollution from the project site during construction. This ordinance also requires preparation of a Post Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to minimize the increase of urban runoff pollution caused by development of the area. ~~The project site is not served by a regional water quality basin but is greater than an acre therefore both~~ Source control measures and onsite treatment control measures are required for the project. Improvements plans must include both source control measures and onsite treatment control measures selected for the site as required by the update Table 3-2 Stormwater Quality Control Measure Selection Matrix in the Stormwater Quality Design Manual (May 2007).

General Stormwater Construction Permit

Development of the site would be required to comply with regulations involving the control of pollution in storm-water discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (Section 402(p), Clean Water Act) and the City's NPDES permit.

The development work area is greater than one acre, and the developer would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include information on runoff, erosion control measures to be employed, and any toxic substance to be used during construction activities. Surface runoff and drainage primarily limited to areas disturbed by grading during construction. Short term, construction-related, erosion control would be readily available by means of Best Management Practices (BMP's) (e.g., use of erosion control barriers, hydro-seeding). Long term erosion control would be accomplished by establishing vegetation and controlling surface water flow.

The City requires use of the best available technology that is economically achievable and best

conventional pollutant control technology to reduce pollutants. The specific features would be discussed in the SWPPP. A monitoring program would be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures included in the SWPPP. The RWQCB may review the final drainage plans for the project components.

Compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements, designed to maintain and improve water quality from development activities, would ensure that the proposed project would have a **less** than significant impact on drainage and water quality.

QUESTION B

The project site is located within Flood Zone X. The Flood Zone identifies areas of 500-year flood and areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile, and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood. Impacts from flooding would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>9. <u>NOISE</u></p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project's noise level increases?</p>		X	
<p>B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L_{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project?</p>			X
<p>C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance?</p>			X
<p>D) Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction?</p>			X
<p>E) Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations?</p>			X
<p>F) Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic?</p>			X

ACOUSTICAL TERMINOLOGY

Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Sound is defined as any pressure variation in air that the human ear can detect. If the pressure variations occur frequently enough (at least 20 times per second) they can be heard and are called sound. The number of pressure variations per second is called the frequency of sound, and is expressed as cycles per second, or Hertz (Hz).

Sound levels are usually measured on a logarithm scale and expressed in decibels (dB) with 0 dB being the threshold of hearing. Decibel levels range from 0 to 140. Typical examples of decibel levels would be a low decibel level of 50 dB for light traffic to a high decibel level of 120 dB for a jet takeoff at 200 feet. The human ear cannot detect changes of less than 3dB.

The perceived loudness of sound depends on many factors, including the sound pressure level, frequency and the sensitivity of the receiver.

The decibel scale can be adjusted for community noise impact assessment to consider the additional sensitivity to different pitches (through the A-weighting mechanism) and to consider the sensitivity

during evening and nighttime hours (through the Community Noise Equivalent Level and Day-Night Average). Community noise is commonly described in terms of the “ambient” noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment, and is measured by the L_{eq} which is an average, or equivalent, noise level.

The day-night average sound level (L_{dn}) represents sound exposure averaged over a 24-hour period. L_{dn} values are calculated using hourly L_{eq} values, with the L_{eq} values for the nighttime period (10:00 P.M.-7:00 A.M.) increased by 10 dB to reflect the greater disturbance potential from nighttime noises. Sounds that occur in the late night and early morning hours are perceived as being louder than the same sound heard during daytime hours.

Sensitive noise receptors typically include residences, schools, child care centers, hospitals, long-term health care facilities, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Residential land uses are located adjacent to the project site.

The 2030 General Plan modeled the noise level on Elder Creek Roadway at Policy Area buildout. The calculated noise levels at 100 feet were anticipated to be at 65 CNEL at Policy Area buildout (GP MEIR, Appendix D).

The Exterior Noise Compatibility Standard for Land Uses that include “Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes” (the closest land use types to community center) states the highest level of noise exposure that is regarded as “Normally Acceptable” would be 70 dBA. (GP MEIR, page 6.8-24)

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project is located adjacent to and west of Bruceville Road and is at the western terminus of Damaschas Drive. The western and eastern perimeter of the project site has existing residential land use. Traffic on Bruceville Road and future light rail operations in Lots A and B are considered potential significant noise sources.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts due to noise may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan MEIR:

- result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project’s noise level increases;
- result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L_{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2030 General Plan to increase

noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior (Policy EC 3.1.1) and interior (EC 3.1.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.9, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 6.8-1) and interior noise levels (Impact 6.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 6.8-4) were found to be significant and unavoidable.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None Applicable

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A, B, D AND E

Exterior Traffic Noise Exposure

To describe the characteristics of the traffic noise affecting the project site, Brown-Buntin Associates (BBA) performed short-term traffic noise level measurement on the proposed site on October 26, 2008. A concurrent count of traffic on Bruceville Road was also made during the short-term noise level measurement. To describe the effective day/night distribution of traffic noise for Bruceville Road, 24-hour continuous monitoring of traffic noise was conducted on the project site on October 26-27, 2006.

To predict future Bruceville Road traffic noise levels in terms of the L_{dn} descriptor, inputs to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) model include the average daily traffic volume (ADT), day/night traffic distribution, medium and heavy truck percentages, and vehicle speed. The predicted future traffic noise level for outdoor activity area of residences adjacent to Bruceville Road would exceed the City of Sacramento normally acceptable exterior noise level at 64.1 dB Ldn.

The following mitigation would ensure compliance with the City of Sacramento's "normally acceptable" exterior noise exposure standard of 60 dB L_{dn} within all proposed project backyards:

Interior Traffic Noise Mitigation

Typical façade designs and constructions in accordance with prevailing industry practices would result in an exterior-to-interior noise attenuation of 20 to 25 dB with windows closed, depending upon the materials used for façade construction. The proposed project will meet the interior noise level standard of 45 dB L_{dn} in upper-floor noise sensitive rooms.

The proposed project is also required to meet State Building Energy Efficient Standards (Title 24) and will have energy conservation measures built into the project, which would provide for noise insulation as well.

The following mitigation would ensure compliance with the City of Sacramento's "normally acceptable" residential interior noise exposure standard of 45 dB L_{dn} :

QUESTION C

The proposed project may temporarily increase noise in the area due to construction activities. The City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance exempts construction-related noise between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Increases in noise levels resulting from construction activities would be temporary, and would be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. The impact would be less than significant.

QUESTIONS E AND F

The construction of the proposed project will not expose existing residential areas to vibration peak particle velocities because the construction of homes does not require the use of blasting, pile driving, or heavy earth-moving machinery. The project site does not contain historic buildings or known archaeological resources; therefore, project construction vibration is less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Noise 1

- a. A noise barrier shall be constructed with solid construction, such as masonry or stucco, with no gaps or holes that would compromise noise insulation performance along the eastern property line of the proposed project. The noise barrier shall be 8 feet high above building pad elevations ~~north~~ south of Damascas Drive, on the eastern side of lots 1 through 10 and ~~south~~ north of Damascas Drive, on the eastern side of lots 37 through 49.
- b. The noise barrier at lots 10 and 37 shall extend from the rear lot line to the front of the house façade.

Noise 2

- a. Exterior facades facing Bruceville Road shall be finished with stucco or brick siding.
- b. Air conditioning or other suitable mechanical ventilation shall be provided to the homes to allow residents to close windows for the desired acoustical isolation.

Findings

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Noise can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>10. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u></p> <p>Would the project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The nearest Sacramento Fire Department stations to the proposed project site are; Station No. 7 located at 6500 Wyndham Drive in Sacramento, Station No. 57 located at 7927 East Parkway in Sacramento and Station No. 16 located at 7363 24th Street in Sacramento.

The area is served by the Sacramento City Police Department. The Joseph E. Rooney Police Facility serves the south area of Sacramento and is located at 5303 Franklin Boulevard approximately 7.4 miles south of the project site.

The proposed project site is within the Elk Grove Unified School District.

The North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area is located adjacent to the project site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2030 General Plan on various public services. These include parks (Chapter 6.9) and police, fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency services (Chapter 6.10).

The general plan provides that adequate staffing levels for police and fire are important for the long-term health, safety and well-being of the community (Goal PHS 1.1, PHS 2.1). The Master EIR concluded that effects would be less than significant.

General plan policies that call for the City to consider impacts of new development on schools (see, for example, Policy ERC 1.1.2 setting forth locational criteria, and Policy ERC 1.1.5 that encourages joint-use development of facilities) reduced impacts on schools to a less-than-significant level. Impacts on library facilities were also considered less than significant (Impact 6.10-8).

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None Applicable

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTION

The City's General Fund and other special collections such as Measure G, state school funds and developer fees provide the financial support to achieve basic safety, school, library and park services. Police/fire personnel, schools, libraries, and parks provide a wide range of services that are affected by population increases.

Fire Protection

Implementation of the project would result in an increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency services. The proposed project would incorporate design features identified in the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code. The Fire Department reviews and comments on the design of any proposed project that could affect fire safety. With incorporation of fire safety measures required by the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code, as well as City permitting requirements, any physical fire safety impacts associated with the project would be result in a **less than significant** impact.

Police

The City of Sacramento Police Department provides police protection services within the City of Sacramento. The Department takes an active role in crime prevention through the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Program (CPTED). This program requires new development to coordinate with the Community Resources Division of the Police Department to facilitate public safety through appropriate design of new residential developments. The incorporation of City permitting requirements and CPTED Program would reduce any physical public safety impacts associated with the project to a **less than significant** impact.

Schools

The project proposes to construct a 49 small-lot, single-family subdivision on approximately 4.7 net acres. Public schools in the vicinity of the project site are operated by the Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD). The 49 lots would add students to the EGUSD.

The State of California has traditionally been responsible for the funding of local public schools. Assembly Bill 2926 allows school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space. Senate Bill 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) and Proposition 1A provides a comprehensive school facility financing such as special school construction funding resolutions and/or agreements between developers.

Senate Bill 50 has resulted in full State preemption of school mitigation, enabling the district to collect a fee that is equal to the current statutory Level I fees. Senate Bill 50 also allows the district to collect additional fees in an amount that would approximate 50 percent of the cost of additional facilities, where justified. The collection of the 50 percent mitigation fees assumes that the State School Facility funding program remains intact and that State funds are still available for partial funding of new school facilities. If the funds are not available, districts may collect up to 100 percent mitigation fees under certain circumstances. Satisfaction of the statutory requirements by a developer (payment of fees) is deemed to be full and complete mitigation.

The proposed project would not increase the City's General Plan build out population. Because the

project is consistent with the General Plan and the payment of school impact fees mitigate for the additional students, the impact to schools would be less than significant.

The proposed project site will be providing required to meet the service ratio for the total residents generated, and pursuant to State ordinances, the applicant will be required to pay adequate fees to enable the city to finance future neighborhood / community parkland. Therefore, impacts to neighborhood / community serving parkland are considered less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Public Services.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
11. RECREATION Would the project: A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?			X
B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

North Laguna Creek Park and Jacinto Creek Park are within approximately 0.5 mile of the project site. The North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area is located adjacent to the project site. The City of Sacramento approved the Parks and Recreation Department, North Laguna Creek Wildlife Bike Trail Project in 2003. The North Laguna Creek Wildlife Bike Trail is a Class I bike trail along the North Laguna Creek Parkway between Center Parkway and Bruceville Road in the south area of Sacramento.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to recreational resources are considered significant if the proposed project would do either of the following:

- cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities; or
- create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Chapter 6.9 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2030 General Plan on the City’s existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities and recreational services. The general plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal ERC 2.1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities. (Policy ERC 2.2.4) Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies. (Impacts 6.9-1 and 6.9-2)

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None applicable.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

The project would result in the construction of a 49-unit residential development. The project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the site, and would not generate a greater impact on such resources than has been identified in the 2030 General Plan MEIR. The project proponent would be responsible for paying the Park Development Fee to mitigate impacts to park facilities. The relatively small increase in population that could result from the project would result in a less than significant impact related to recreational facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Recreation.

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>12. <u>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</u> Would the project:</p> <p>A) Roadway segments: degrade peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A,B,C or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.</p>			X
<p>B) Intersections: degrade peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or F (with project) or the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more?</p>			X
<p>C) Freeway facilities: off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway; project traffic increases that cause any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's level of service; project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or the expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity?</p>			X
<p>D) Transit: adversely affect public transit operations or fail to adequately provide for access to public?</p>			X
<p>E) Bicycle facilities: adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle?</p>			X
<p>F) Pedestrian: adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The existing roadway component of the transportation system within the study area is described below.

Existing Roadways

Regional automobile access to the site is provided primarily by Bruceville Road. Access to and from Bruceville Road is provided by Sheldon Road, Jacinto Road, or Center Parkway. Local automobile access is provided by a system of arterial and collector roadways in the project vicinity.

Bruceville Road is a four-lane arterial road that runs north to south from Valley Hi Drive to Desmond Road (in the Consumnes River Preserve) in Sacramento County.

Sheldon Road is a four-lane arterial road that runs west to east from Bruceville Road to Grant Line Road.

Jacinto Road is a two-lane collector road that runs east-west from Calvine Road and West Stockton Boulevard. West of Bruceville Road it becomes Jacinto Avenue.

Center Parkway is a four-lane arterial road that runs north to south from A Parkway to Sheldon Road.

TRANSIT SYSTEM

RT operates ~~80~~ 65 bus routes and 26.9 miles of light rail covering a 418 square-mile service area. Buses and light rail run 365 days a year using 76 light rail vehicles, ~~258~~ 236 buses powered by compressed natural gas (CNG) and 17 shuttle vans. Buses operate daily from 5:00 a.m. to ~~11:30~~ 9:45 p.m. every 15 to 60 minutes, depending on the route. Light rail trains operate from 4:30 a.m. to ~~1:00 a.m.~~ 10:30 p.m. daily with service every 15 minutes during the day and every 30 minutes in the evening.

Elk Grove Transit (e-tran) operates commuter service between the City of Elk Grove and Downtown Sacramento.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts resulting from changes in transportation or circulation may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan MEIR:

Roadway Segments

- A) the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A,B,C or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or
- B) the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

Intersections

- the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or F (with project) or
- the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more.

Freeway Facilities

Caltrans considers the following to be significant impacts.

- off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway;
- project traffic increases that cause any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's level of service;
- project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or
- the expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity.

Transit

- adversely affect public transit operations or
- fail to adequately provide for access to public transit.

Bicycle Facilities

- adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or
- fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.

Pedestrian Circulation

- adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or
- fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 6.12. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and aviation components. The analysis included consideration of roadway capacity and identification of levels of service, and effects of the 2030 General Plan on the public transportation system. Provisions of the 2030 General Plan that provide substantial guidance include Goal Mobility 1.1, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated and maintained, promotion of multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1), identification of level of service standards (Policy M 1.2.2), development of a fair share funding system for Caltrans facilities (Policy M 1.5.6) and development of complete streets (Goal M 4.2).

While the general plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, the Master EIR concluded that the general plan development would result in significant and unavoidable effects. See Impacts 6.12-1, 6.12-8 (roadway segments in the City), Impacts 6.12-2, 6.12-9 (roadway segments in neighboring jurisdictions), and Impacts 6.12-3, 6.12-10 (freeway segments).

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None applicable.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A, B AND C

Trip generation was estimated using the ITE's Trip Generation, Seventh Edition. The total number of additional trips estimated for the proposed project is 539 daily vehicle trips, 44 a.m. peak-hour trips and 56 p.m. peak-hour trips (Personal Communication, Aelita Milatzo, August 4, 2008). The City's Development Engineering Division determined that the trip generation is below the impact threshold in the a.m. and in the p.m. peak hours and the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the existing or future roadway system.

The total project peak-hour number of trips would not be considered substantial and would not degrade LOS on roadways, intersections or freeway facilities to unacceptable levels. The proposed project would result in a **less than significant** impact related to increased vehicle trips and traffic congestion.

QUESTION D

The nearest bus service is provided at Bruceville Road and Calvine Road by Regional Transit Route 54. Route 54 connects at the Florin light rail station, Blue Line which provides routes from the Meadowview light rail station to Watt/I-80 light rail station.

A Regional Transit light rail line is planned for operation on the west side of Bruceville Road, and the project is required to make an irrevocable offer of dedication of land for such purposes. Regional Transit has not funded or designed the new line, and has not completed environmental review for the project. The new line would be designed and operated in a manner consistent with applicable standards. The proposed project would not interfere with the new light rail line.

The proposed project would not interfere with existing modes of alternative transportation or decrease the level of service provided by Regional Transit. Any impact would be less than significant.

With the exception of the future extension of light rail along Bruceville Road, there are no railroad tracks or navigable waterways within, or adjacent to the project site. Impacts to rail or waterways would be less than significant.

QUESTIONS E AND F

Pursuant to section 16.48.110 of the City of Sacramento Code, street and roadway improvements are designed and constructed to City standards in place at the time that the building permit is issued. All such improvements are designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Traffic Engineering Division and this would ensure that there would be no hazards to safety from design features or incompatible uses.

The proposed project would not result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or pedestrian/motor vehicle conflicts. Impacts of the project related to design hazards or hazards to bicyclist/pedestrians would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Transportation and Circulation.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
13. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project: A) Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments?			X
B) Require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Water. The City of Sacramento is identified as the water supplier for the proposed project. The project is within the City's Water Service Area. The City of Sacramento obtains water from three sources: the American River, the Sacramento River, and groundwater wells. Treated water is currently produced at two water treatment plants: the Fairbairn Water Treatment Plan (WTP) on the American River, and the Sacramento WTP on the Sacramento River.

Surface Water Rights: According to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) (p. 4-2), the City holds an annual surface water entitlement of 81,000 acre-feet from the Sacramento River, and, ultimately, 245,000 acre-feet from the American River. The total annual diversion allowed by the City's four American River permits is 245,000 acre-feet at build-out of these entitlements in the year 2030. The maximum total combined water supply from both the Sacramento and American River by the year 2030 is 326,800 acre-feet.

According to the UWMP (p. 6-1), about 18 percent of the City's water demand is currently met through groundwater wells. The groundwater is generally of good quality. The City focuses on surface water and minimizes reliance on groundwater to avoid water quality problems and reduce the City's contribution to possible groundwater overdraft conditions.

Water Supply. Water supply facilities in the project area include an 8" inch water main located in Damascas Drive. A water main extension is required in the 41' proposed street section. An existing 24" water main exists in Bruceville Road, however, no connection is allowed to the 24' water transmission main. A water supply test would be required to determine if adequate flows and pressure can be provided to the entire site. Only one domestic water service is allowed per parcel and water meters shall be located at the point of service which is the back of curb for separated sidewalks or the back of walk for connected sidewalks. A project specific water study is required and water meters shall be located to the satisfaction of the Department of Utilities.

Stormwater Drainage. The project site is located within drainage shed G273. There is no existing drainage main in Damascas Drive. A drainage main extension in Damascas Drive (within the proposed public street) would be required as a condition of approval for the proposed project. The drainage main extension would connect to the existing 60" drainage main in Bruceville Road unless otherwise approved by DOU.

Sewage. Sewage facilities in the project area include a 6” inch sewer main located in Damascas Drive and a 15” sewer line in Bruceville Road. A sewer main extension within the proposed street would be required, to be determined by Sacramento Area Sewer District. The proposed project is located within the Sacramento Area Sewer District (formally known as CSD-1). The Sacramento Area Sewer District serves as on contributing agency to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD). The Sacramento Area Sewer District is responsible for the collection of wastewater from unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove and portions of Folsom and Sacramento. SRCSD is responsible for the conveyance and treatment of the wastewater which includes the ownership and maintenance of larger inceptor pipelines and all activities at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant outside of Elk Grove, California. The proposed project must satisfy all of Sacramento Area Sewer District requirements.

Solid Waste. The project is required to meet the City’s Recycling and Solid Waste Disposal Regulations (Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Ordinance). The purpose of the ordinance is to regulate the location, size, and design of features of recycling and trash enclosures in order to provide adequate, convenient space for the collection, storage, and loading of recyclable and solid waste material for existing and new development; increase recycling of used materials; and reduce litter. City solid waste collection services transport waste to the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station, located at 8191 Fruitridge Road, where it is ultimately transported to Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. The Lockwood Landfill has an approximate 40-year capacity.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, or school facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2030 General Plan:

- result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments or
- require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR, INCLUDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS, GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS, AND IRREVERSIBLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Master EIR evaluated the effects of development under the 2030 General Plan on water supply, sewer and storm drainage, solid waste, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications. See Chapter 6.11.

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2030 General Plan. Policies in the general plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 6.11-1) but the need for new water supply facilities results in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 6.11-2). The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a significant and unavoidable effect (Impacts 6.11-4, 6.11-5). Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant (Impacts 6.11-7, 6.11-8). Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less-than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT

None applicable.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

Sewage facilities in the project area include a 6" inch sewer main located in Damascas Drive and a 15" sewer line in Bruceville Road. A sewer main extension within the proposed street would be required, to be determined by Sacramento Area Sewer District. The proposed project is located within the Sacramento Area Sewer District (formally known as CSD-1). The project would be required to comply with all requirements established by the Sacramento Area Sewer District and the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities. Impacts from sewer services would be less than significant.

Based on the figures presented in the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), Sacramento's water supply is sufficient through year 2030. The UWMP confirms the City's ability to meet anticipated water demand and indicates that the City of Sacramento has sufficient water rights and the infrastructure to deliver water in normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years. The City would continue water conservation programs to reduce demand within the City (P. 7-4). Impacts from water treatment and supplies would be **less than significant**.

Drainage from the proposed paved surfaces and buildings would be required to connect to the existing City's public drainage system. All onsite systems would be designed to the City's standard for private storm drainage systems per Section 11.12 of the Design and Procedures Manual.

The project site is located within drainage shed G273. Water supply facilities in the project area include a 60" inch water main located Bruceville Road. There is no existing drainage main in Damascas Drive. A drainage main extension in Damascas Drive (within the proposed public street) would be required as a condition of approval for the proposed project. The drainage main extension would connect to the existing 60" drainage main in Bruceville Road unless otherwise approved by DOU. A water supply test would be required to determine if adequate flows and pressure can be provided to the entire site.

All drainage improvements would be required to be developed to the satisfaction of the Department of Utilities. All drainage lines would be placed within the asphalt section of public rights-of-way as per the City's Design and Procedures Manual. A water study would be required by the Department of Utilities to show that the drainage system has the capacity to accept drainage.

Because the Department of Utilities would ensure that project's drainage system is appropriately sized and is connected appropriately to the City's drainage system, the project impacts on the City's drainage facilities would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Utilities and Service Systems.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>14. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u></p> <p>A.) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>		X	
<p>B.) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>			X
<p>C.) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>			X

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

As discussed in the preceding sections, the proposed project, with the implementation of the mitigation measures, would not degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants. The proposed project may affect cultural resources within the project site. Mitigation language has been included in the case that previously unidentified cultural or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction. Mitigation has been proposed in order to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

QUESTION B

Section 15130 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines state that “No further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, matter or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or area-wide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed.”

The proposed project would result in additional significant environmental effects to biological resources, noise, hazards and cultural resources. However, all impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. None of these impacts would affect offsite resources and would not result in significant cumulative impacts.

For these reasons, there are no cumulatively considerable impacts and the impact is less than significant.

QUESTION D

The project does not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The environmental effect on humans would be less than significant.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SECTION V - DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial study:

- X I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2030 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project **will** have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the project as appropriate, and additional feasible mitigation measures and alternatives will be incorporated to revise the proposed project before the negative declaration is circulated for public review, to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b))

Signature _____

Date _____

REFERENCES CITED

Air Resources Board, GHG Emission Inventory Summary (1990-2004)

http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/ghg/ghg_sector_data.php

City of Sacramento. 2009 *2030 General Plan*.

City of Sacramento. 2008. *Sacramento 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*

City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities. 2007. *Table 3-2 Stormwater Quality Control Measure Selection Matrix in the Stormwater Quality Design Manual*.

Institute for Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation 7th Edition

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) 2004. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*.

Barnett, D. Bruce, Ph.D. Environmental Consulting & Regulatory Compliance Services. 2008.

Wetlands and Biological Resources Assessment Bruceville Road American Dream Project Sacramento, California.

Bate, Jay., ISA Certified Arborist WE-1257, Kemper Tree Care, Inc. 2007 *JMC Home, Bruceville American Dream Project, Sacramento County, California. Arborist Report/Tree Inventory*.

Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. 2007. *Environmental Noise Analysis, Bruceville American Dream, City of Sacramento, California, BBA Project No. 06-265*.

City of Sacramento, Department of Parks and Recreation. 2003. *North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area Bike Trail, Master Plan*.

City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities and County of Sacramento Water Resources Division, 2000. *January 2000 Guidance Manual for On-Site Stormwater Quality Control Measures*.

ESA, September 2005. *North Laguna Creek Wildlife Bike Trail Project: Low Effect Habitat Conservation Plan*. Prepared for the City of Sacramento by ESA Associates, Sacramento.

Hansen, Eric. C. July 7, 2005. *Assessment of potential impacts to Giant Garter Snake (Thamnophis gigas) resulting from the proposed North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area Bike Trail, Sacramento County, California*. Report submitted to the City of Sacramento; Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, CA.

Raney Geotechnical, Inc. 2006. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Bruceville American Dream Property, APNs 117-021-017, -018, -021, -027, and -028*.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) 2004. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). February 9, 2004. *Programmatic Formal Consolation for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 303 Permitted with Relatively Small effects on the Giant Garter Snake within Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter and Yolo Counties, California*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. 1-1-F-97-149.21 pp. + appendices.

ATTACHMENTS