



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:

CVS at Florin and Freeport (P10-044) - The proposed project includes a request for approval of a tentative map to subdivide two parcels located at the southeast corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road (APN 047-0021-018-0000 and 047-0091-015) into five separate parcels, and to rezone one parcel totaling 1.68 acres to C-2-EA-2 to allow a drive-through facility. The project seeks entitlements required for the construction of pharmacy retail store at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road. The requested map would create a parcel of approximately 1.7 acres to serve as the site for the pharmacy. The proposed store would be approximately 16,500 square feet in floor area providing health and beauty aids, personal care items, gift items, beer, wine, distilled spirits, common household goods, vitamins and retail pharmaceutical products available over-the-counter or by prescription from the in-store pharmacy. The store would provide photo processing. The project proposes a drive-through facility for prescription pharmaceuticals drop-off and pick-up only. The operation of a drive-through facility requires a special permit, and the project design results in a stacking area for cars that does not meet minimum design requirements and, therefore, requires approval of a variance.

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: _____

Date: _____

1/28/2011

CVS AT FLORIN AND FREEPORT [P10-044]

REVISED INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR ANTICIPATED SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS UNDER THE 2030 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

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

The proposed project was revised following circulation of the initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for public review. The revision added a requested entitlement to rezone Parcel 1, the northwest 1.68 acres of the site, from Limited Commercial (C-1-EA-2) to General Commercial (C-2-EA-2). The rezone is required because drive-through facilities, as proposed for the retail pharmacy, are not allowed in the C-1 zone. Changes to the initial study are shown in ~~strikethrough~~ 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

Project Name and File Number: CVS at Florin and Freeport (P10-044)

Project Location: Southeast corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road,
City of Sacramento, Sacramento, California (APN 047-
0021-018-0000; 047-0091-015-0000)

Project Applicant: Josh Eisenhut, Armstrong Development
1375 Exposition Boulevard, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA 95815
Telephone: (916) 643-9610

Project Planner: Evan Compton, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 808-5260
Email: ecompton@cityofsacramento.org

Environmental Planner: Dana Allen, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 808-2762
Email: dallen@cityofsacramento.org

Date Initial Study Completed: January 7, 2011

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 2030 General Plan and Master EIR are 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.sacgp.org.

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 20-day review period ending February 1, 2010.

Please send written responses to:

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

SECTION II—PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes a request for approval of a tentative map to subdivide two parcels located at the southeast corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road (APN 047-0021-018-0000 and 047-0091-015)) into five separate parcels. See Attachment 1, Vicinity Map.

The project site is approximately 7.5 acres in size. The 2030 General Plan land use designation for the site is Suburban Corridor. The portion of the site at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road is Limited Commercial, Executive Airport Overlay Zone. Consistency with land use designations is discussed below under Land Use.

The project seeks entitlements required for the construction of pharmacy retail store at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road. The requested map would create a parcel of approximately 1.7 acres to serve as the site for the pharmacy. See Attachment 2, Tentative Map. The proposed store would be approximately 16,500 square feet in floor area providing health and beauty aids, personal care items, gift items, beer, wine, distilled spirits, common household goods, vitamins and retail pharmaceutical products available over-the-counter or by prescription from the in-store pharmacy. The store would provide photo processing.

The project proposes a drive-through facility for prescription pharmaceuticals drop-off and pick-up only. The operation of a drive-through facility requires a special permit, and the project design results in a stacking area for cars that does not meet minimum design requirements and, therefore, requires approval of a variance.

The retail pharmacy store would be operated 24-hours per day, seven days per week. Approximately 25-30 persons would be employed.

The store would receive regular weekly deliveries of merchandise for sale, typically by a tractor-trailer with 42-foot trailer. Up to three deliveries by such trucks are common for the operation of similar stores.

The retail pharmacy store is the only development proposed on the site as part of the project, and would occupy Parcel 1. Future development on the site is not proposed, and timing of any future development is uncertain. As part of the planning process to determine whether the use requirements applicable under the Zoning Code would be satisfied, and to identify potential impacts from eventual build-out, the applicant was required to provide an estimate of the type and density of development that could occur on the project site. See Attachment 3, Site Plan. The future proposed development that was identified, and which forms the basis for impact review, would include the construction of a mixture of retail, restaurant and office uses, as follows:

Parcel 2 (0.761 acres)	Drive-through fast-food restaurant (3,067 square feet)
Parcel 3 (0.810 acres)	Retail (8,400 square feet)
Parcel 4 (0.843 acres)	Retail (6,750 square feet)

Parcel 5 (3.072 acres) Medical Office (3 separate buildings totaling 20,500 square feet, and restaurant with 5,880 square feet)

The project includes typical subdivision improvements along Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road frontages, including sidewalk, landscaping, curb and gutter. The discussion below under Transportation identifies additional improvements that would be required within existing streets to respond to potential impacts for traffic.

The project includes the following site improvements: entrance and exits to Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road, 85 paved parking spaces, 4 handicap parking spaces, landscaping for the parking lot for aesthetics purposes and to achieve the required shading (i.e., 50% of parking area shaded within fifteen years).

The project includes the following entitlements:

- Rezone of Parcel 1 (1.68 acres on the northwest corner of the site) from Limited Commercial (C-1-EA-2) to General Commercial (C-2-EA-2);
- Tentative map to subdivide two parcels totaling approximately 7.35 acres into five parcels;
- Special Permit to allow the operation of a drive-through within the Limited Commercial (C-4-2-R-EA-2) zone;
- Variance to reduce the required stacking depth for the drive-through lane; and
- Development Plan Review for the site.

The proposed project requires hearing and review by the Planning Commission.

Attachments

Attachment 1 Vicinity Map

Attachment 2 Tentative Map

Attachment 3 Site Plan

Attachment 4 Land Use and Zoning

Attachment 5 Sacramento Area Council of Governments letter re: EA Zone

Attachment 6 Air Quality Data

Attachment 7 Historical Resources Evaluation

Attachment 8 Traffic Impact Study, City of Sacramento, December 2010

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, as well as energy.

Discussion

Land Use and Population

The 2030 General Plan land use designation for the site is Suburban Corridor. See Attachment 4, Land Use and Zoning. This designation is applied to parcels along major roadways and is envisioned as suitable for development with auto-oriented, moderate-density retail, office and residential uses that support surrounding suburban neighborhoods. Typical development characteristics include moderate lot coverage and setbacks, one- to four-story buildings, buildings with a high degree of pedestrian-oriented uses located at street level, and attractive streetscapes with sidewalks. The planning process, via the site plan review, provides the City with authority to ensure that the proposed development at the project is consistent with the general plan provisions. The project would be consistent with the 2030 general Plan land use designation. The 2030 General Plan may be reviewed at www.sacpg.org.

The portion of the site at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road is Limited Commercial, Executive Airport Overlay Zone (C-1-R-EA-2). This zoning designation includes the following components:

~~C-1: This is a limited commercial zone which allows certain office, retail stores, and commercial service establishments which are compatible with residential developments. This zone is intended to be applied to small parcels which are surrounded by a residential neighborhood.~~

C-2: This is a general commercial zone which provides for the sale of commodities, or performance of services, including repair facilities, offices, small wholesale stores or distributors, and limited processing and packaging.

R: A plan review is required for any proposed development. A plan review allows for the review of a proposed development plan to ensure, among other things, that the proposed development is consistent with the general plan; that the utilities and infrastructure are sufficient to support the proposed development and are compatible with city standards; and that the proposed development is compatible with surrounding development.

EA: The EA designates a zone overlay that applies to areas affected the operations at the Sacramento Executive Airport. Development in this zone is subject to three standards: height (building must be less than 50 feet in height), noise (buildings must be located outside the 65 dB contour) and safety (development located within the Approach Departure 1 Safety Zone is restricted by use and density). In the case of safety, the land use category of "grocery store and drug store" is allowed, as long as the development does not result in concentrations of people greater than 50 persons per acre at any time.

Review of development and densities in the EA zone is within the purview of the Airport Land Use Commission. Staff at the Sacramento Area Council of Governments serve as staff for the Commission, and reviewed the proposal. Staff concluded that the maximum allowed density for the project site (84 persons based on 1.68 acres) had not been exceeded at a similar store across the street, and would not be exceeded in this case. SACOG staff noted that any development proposal for the remaining parcels would be evaluated each on their own as specific developments were proposed. See Attachment 5.

The EA designation is to be applied to four safety areas: the clear zone; the approach-departure zone 1; the approach-departure zone 2; and the overflight zone. The clear zone (EA-1) is near the end of the runway and is the most restrictive. The approach-departure zones (EA-2, EA-3) are located under the takeoff and landing slopes and are less restrictive. The overflight zone (EA-4) is the area under the traffic pattern and is even less restrictive. The zone applicable to the site on which the retail pharmacy store would be located (Parcel 1) is EA-2. As indicated in the SACOG review, the proposed use is allowed in this zone district.

The uses proposed as part of the project are consistent with the general plan and zoning designations for the project site. The project does not include housing, and would not result in additional population. The project site is vacant, and no housing would be displaced.

The retail uses proposed for the site would be neighborhood-oriented, and would not tend to attract other retail uses or substantial population to the vicinity. The project site is located in an urbanized area of the community that is served by utilities and urban services. As a result the proposed project would not induce substantial growth to the area, nor would the proposed project displace any housing.

The project includes a rezone to C-2 because drive-through facilities are not allowed in the C-1 zone district. (City Code section 17.24.050, note 44) The rezone request does not alter the development proposal for the affected portion of the site affected by the rezone. The environmental analysis for that portion of site as set forth in this initial study remains unchanged.

Agricultural Resources

The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community, completely surrounded by urban residential and commercial development. A portion of the site was used as a baseball field for many years, and has been vacant and unused for several years. The site does not support agricultural operations of any kind. Development of the site with urban uses would have no effect on agricultural resources.

Energy

All structures on the project site would be developed in a manner consistent with the City's building code. As of January 1, 2011, the building code will include provisions that require building standards to ensure that sustainable building practices and efficient energy standards are followed. Review of building plans will ensure that the project does not result in wasteful energy practices.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
1. <u>AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE</u> Would the proposal:		X	
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	

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.

QUESTIONS A AND B

The proposed project would subdivide a vacant 7.6-acre parcel, and construct a retail pharmacy store at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road. Additional development on the remaining four parcels is not proposed, but has been projected to include two restaurants, retail areas and three office buildings.

The retail pharmacy and the anticipated future uses are consistent with the general plan and zoning designations for the project site. Urban development on a currently-vacant parcel would result in additional sources of lighting, including lighting for parking and sidewalk areas, and exterior lighting on buildings. Design of buildings, as anticipated in the Master EIR in Mitigation Measure 6.13-1, could result in glare effects on neighboring properties and persons using the site. These new light sources could result in light spill onto neighboring residential parcels unless appropriate designed and installed. This could be a significant effect.

The mitigation measures identified below would ensure that building designs are consistent with the measures identified in the Master EIR for avoidance of glare, and avoid effects on neighboring properties.

With implementation of the identified mitigation, any additional significant environmental effects relating to light and glare would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES

LG-1

Structures proposed on the project site shall be designed to avoid the use of the following features:

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

LG-2

Security or exterior lighting on building facades facing residential areas shall be designed to avoid any direct light or glare onto neighboring properties.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to light and glare 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><u>2. AIR QUALITY</u></p> <p><i>Would the proposal:</i></p>			
<p>A) Result in construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day?</p>			X
<p>B) Result in operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day?</p>			X
<p>C) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>			X
<p>D) Result in 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?</p>		X	
<p>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)?</p>			X
<p>F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>			X
<p>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?</p>			X
<p>H) Impede the City or state efforts to meet AB32 standards for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions?</p>			X

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

Air emissions during construction would occur due to activities consisting of grading and excavation and the actual construction of the structures and improvements. Construction activities may cause the air quality to temporarily degrade during construction due to emissions from heavy construction equipment and ground disturbing activities. Emissions in the grading and excavation phase of construction are primarily associated with exhaust of heavy equipment and the dust that is generated through grading activities. Estimated construction emissions resulting from development of the entire 7.55 acres including the uses identified on the site plan were calculated using the URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4 program, and following the guidelines of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). It is estimated that construction activities of the entire site would generate up to approximately 62.48 pounds of NO_x per day (see Air Quality Data, Attachment 6).

Since it is not known whether the uses other than the CVS pharmacy will be developed within the near future, an estimate of emissions resulting from development of the CVS pharmacy by itself was also completed which found that construction activities would generate approximately 57.51 pounds of NO_x per day. These emissions fall below the threshold of significance for construction emissions. The SMAQMD Guidelines provide that if a project's NO_x emissions from heavy-duty mobile sources are less than significant, as here, then the lead agency may assume that exhaust emissions of other pollutants from operation of equipment and worker commute vehicles are also less than significant.

Based on the analysis of site activities associated with construction of the CVS Pharmacy site at Florin and Freeport, the project would not result in any additional significant environmental effects.

Question B

As described above, the URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 model was used to calculate estimated emissions for the operation of the proposed project and the development of the entire 7.55 acres. Estimated ROG and NO_x emissions for full development of the 7.55 acres were calculated to be approximately 37.05 lbs/day and 62.76 lbs/day, respectively, which is below the 65 lbs/day threshold (see Attachment 6). Since it is unknown if or when the separate 5.8± acres

will be developed, operational emissions were also estimated for just the CVS Pharmacy store since it is the only proposed development at this time. Operational emissions from the CVS Pharmacy store would be approximately 9.44 lbs/day of ROG and 15.96 lbs/day of NOx. Each of these modeling results, one for full development of the entire 7.55 acres and the other for the CVS Pharmacy store by itself, is below the threshold of 65 lbs/day. Operation of the CVS Pharmacy will not create significant operational emissions.

Question C and D

The proposed project involves the construction of 16,500 square feet CVS Pharmacy on approximately 1.7 acres within a 7.55 acre vacant site. At the time of full development, the subject site could also consist of 20,500 square feet of medical offices, a fast-food restaurant with a drive-thru, 15,150 square feet of retail, and a 5,880 square feet sit-down restaurant. 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. The SMAQMD has indicated that projects that implement Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices and disturb less than 15 acres per day would not exceed the concentration based threshold of significance for PM₁₀ and, therefore PM_{2.5}. The subject site is well below the 15 acre criteria; however, the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices are included below as mitigation measures to be implemented during project construction to ensure that PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions would not be significant.

Question E and F

The small amount of traffic generated by construction employees or the 989 net trips generated by the CVS Pharmacy (or with the additional 1,667 net trips at potential buildout of the site) would not result in significant regional air quality impacts or "hot spots" at nearby intersections (**Traffic Impact Study, Attachment 7**). Existing levels of service (LOS) for nearby intersections range from B to D. Upon buildout of the site, the LOS levels of intersections in the area will remain between B to D (the PM trips at the intersection of Florin Road and Southland Park Drive changes LOS from C to D at buildout of the 7.55 acres). No intersection within the area operates at LOS E or F. The existing and future projected LOS levels at buildout of the project site demonstrate that local roadways are not significantly impacted by vehicular traffic. The project will not generate traffic that significantly impacts the air quality at roadway intersections in the area or creates any CO "hot spots."

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 Florin Road, which is an east-west, four-lane arterial that carries approximately 27,900 vehicles per day (vpd). The project site also fronts along Freeport Boulevard, which is a north-south, four-lane arterial that carries approximately 14,600 vpd (**Traffic Impact Study, Attachment 7**). Both Florin's and Freeport's vpd count 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 or I-5 and does not include any sensitive receptors; therefore, impacts related to TACs would not result in any new significant effect.

Question H

As part of its action in approving the 2030 General Plan, the City Council certified the Master Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR) that evaluated the environmental effects of development that is reasonably anticipated under the new general plan. The Master EIR includes extensive discussion of the potential effects of greenhouse gas emissions. The Master EIR discussions regarding climate change are incorporated here by reference. See, for example:

Draft EIR: 6.1 Air Quality (Page 6.1-1)

Final EIR: City Climate Change master Response (Page 4-1)

Errata No. 2: Climate Change (Page 12)

These documents are available at: www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/environmental-review/eirs/ and at the offices of the Community Development Department at 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, California.

The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation for the project site. The project would result in the generation of greenhouse gases during construction and operation, as discussed below.

Short-term Construction Emissions

During construction of the project greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be emitted from the operation of construction equipment and from worker and building supply vendor vehicles. The total CO₂ emissions generated by the construction of the project would be approximately 123.3 metric tons per year for development of the full 7.55 acres (see Attachment 6). These emissions would equate to approximately 0.000026 percent of the estimated GHG emissions for all sources in California (483 million metric tons) (CARB 2009). GHG emissions from development of the CVS Pharmacy alone would result in construction related CO₂ emission of approximately 92.26 metric tons per year, which equates to 0.000019 percent of the estimated GHG emissions for all sources in California.

Long-term Operational Emissions

The largest source of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project would be on- and off-site motor vehicle use. CO₂ emissions, the primary greenhouse gas emission from mobile sources, are directly related to the quantity of fuel consumed. CO₂ emissions during operation of the project at full build-out of the 7.55 acres would be approximately 7,287 metric tons, which equates to 0.0015 percent of California's total emissions. Since it is unknown if or when the remainder of the 5.8 acres will be developed, operational emissions were calculated for the CVS Pharmacy by itself, which resulted in an estimate of approximately 1.850 metric tons per year (see Attachment 6). These emissions would equate to approximately 0.00038 percent of the estimated GHG emissions for all sources in California (483 million metric tons) (CARB 2009)

Buildings constructed as part of the project would be required to comply with current California building codes that require structures to incorporate energy efficient materials and design.

Ongoing Activities

The 2030 General Plan included direction to staff to prepare a Climate Action Plan for the City. Staff has continued work on this plan since adoption of the 2030 General Plan. The Climate Action Plan will provide additional guidance for the City's ongoing efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The tentative completion date for the Climate Action Plan is 2011.

Action continues at the state and federal level to combat climate change. In December 2009 the Environmental Protection Agency listed greenhouse gases as harmful emissions under the Clean Air Act. This action could eventually result in regulations that would have as their purpose the reduction of such emissions.

The Master EIR concluded that greenhouse gas emissions that could be emitted by development that is consistent with the 2030 General Plan would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable (Errata No. 2, Page 12). The Master EIR includes a full analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, and adequately addresses these issues.

The project is consistent with the City's goals as set forth in the 2030 General Plan and Master EIR relating to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The project would not impede the City's efforts to comply with AB32 requirements. The project would not have any significant additional environmental effects relating to greenhouse gas emissions or climate change.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- AQ-1. Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- AQ-2. Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- AQ-3. Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible track out mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- AQ-4. Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- AQ-5. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- AQ-6. Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- AQ-7. Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Air Quality 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
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

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

None.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The project includes a request for a tentative map to create five parcels on the approximately 7.5-acre site. A retail pharmacy would be developed on the corner of Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard. The remainder of the site would remain undeveloped, but the applicant has identified proposed future uses that could include medical office buildings, retail stores and restaurants. None of the proposed uses would generate hazardous materials that could affect neighboring properties or surface areas. Disposal of solid waste or other materials from the site would be directed to the City's ongoing solid waste program, and directed to the appropriate disposal facility. There would be no impact on plant or animal communities in the project area.

Questions B, C

A biological constraints evaluation was conducted by AECOM for the proposed project. The evaluation was conducted by a qualified biologist, and examined the approximately 7.5-acre project site located southeast of the intersection of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road in the City

of Sacramento. The evaluation is focused on sensitive biological resources, including sensitive habitats and special-status species, which could potentially influence project planning, approval, and implementation. An AECOM biologist surveyed the project site on December 15, 2010.

The project site appeared to have been disked within the last 12 months and vegetation on the interior portion of the site is limited to various non-native grasses and other weeds that have emerged following recent rainfall. Evidence of recent disking includes plow furrows in sparsely vegetated portions of what can otherwise be described as a weedy field. Small trees and shrubs are scattered along the perimeter of the site and along a fenceline that crosses the site. Tree and scrub diversity is almost entirely limited to non-native species with the exception of a row of small valley oaks located along a portion of the eastern boundary of the site. The southern portion of the project site was formerly used as a baseball field, which has also been recently disked. The outline of the field is clearly identifiable on recent aerial photographs, and the baseball backstop and storage/snack shack building are still present.

Sensitive Habitats

Sensitive habitats include sensitive natural plant communities and other habitats designated and/or regulated by California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), wetlands and other waters of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of USACE. Aquatic habitats may also receive protection under California statutes including Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

No sensitive natural plant communities or wetlands are present on the project site.

Special-status Species

Special-status species are plants and animals in the following categories:

- Species that are listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as rare, threatened, or endangered;
- Species considered as candidates and proposed for state or federal listing as threatened or endangered;
- Wildlife designated by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) as species of special concern; and
- Plants ranked by DFG as “rare, threatened, or endangered” in California.

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), was used as the primary source of information on sensitive biological resources previously documented in the vicinity of the project site. The CNDDDB is considered as the most current and reliable tool for tracking occurrences of special-status species in California. Seven special-status species have been reported to the CNDDDB from locations within two miles of the project site (Exhibit 1): Sanford’s arrowhead, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, California linderiella, Sacramento splittail, Sacramento perch, burrowing owl, and Swainson’s hawk.

No special-status species are expected to occur on the project site. Sanford’s arrowhead, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, California linderiella, Sacramento splittail, and Sacramento perch all require seasonal or permanent aquatic habitats that are not present.

The Swainson’s hawk is not expected to use the project site because no suitable nesting habitat

or foraging habitat is present. There are three CNDDDB occurrences for Swainson's hawk nesting sites within two miles of the project site. All three occurrences are located along the Sacramento River, which is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site and west of Interstate 5.

The lack of mature trees and high level of human disturbance associated with surrounding urban development precludes use of the project site for nesting. Swainson's hawks are known to forage in weedy fields, However, other characteristics of suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat are absent from the project site. Characteristics of suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawks include large parcels of land with low to moderate levels of disturbance and abundant prey. The project site is small and surrounded by development. Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard are both busy roadways with high volumes of traffic, which may further discourage use by Swainson's hawks. Swainson's hawks forage on a variety of prey including small mammals and insects.

The project site is expected to support a few potential prey species (e.g., house mouse) but prey density is expected to be very low due to recent disking and the adverse effects that the surrounding development is likely to have on prey species that are most abundant on large, less disturbed, land parcels. No small mammals or small mammal burrows were observed on the project site during the field survey.

Burrowing owls can be found on small parcels of disturbed land within urbanized environments, and non-native grassland is considered suitable habitat for this species. However, burrowing owls require ground squirrel burrows or other suitable underground burrows for nesting. No suitable burrows were found on the project site during the December field survey. Therefore, it is appropriate to conclude that this species does not currently occupy the project site.

Based on the field survey results, and database and literature review, the project site does not currently support sensitive biological resources, and the project would have a less-than-significant effect on biological resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

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

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	

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.

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, Cultural Resources. 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

None.

QUESTIONS A AND B

The site would be developed with urban uses, involving installation of utilities, paving, and standard construction of structures. Some excavation would be required, and it is possible that such activities could encounter historic or archaeological resources. This could be a significant

effect. The mitigation measures identified below would ensure that any impacts that resulted from such discoveries would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The approximately 7.5-acre site was evaluated for potential historic and cultural resources. A qualified historian from AECOM conducted the evaluation. See Attachment 7, Historical resource Evaluation. Research regarding the property was conducted at the Center for Sacramento History, County of Sacramento Assessor office, Online Archive of California, Sacramento Room of the Central Sacramento Public Library and the Sanborn Maps database of the Los Angeles Public Library online collection. A site visit was conducted during which the entire site was examined on foot with transects of no more than 20 meters. No artifacts or cultural constituents were observed.

A baseball field, backstop and accessory structure, apparently the snack bar building, are located on the project site. The baseball field was created in the early 1960's during the development of the surrounding Oakmont Terrace Subdivision. The property was owned by the State of California and was transferred to the City of Sacramento in 1973. The land was leased to the Willow Rancho Little League, one of several little leagues operating in Sacramento at the time.

Research did not reveal that the property, or any individuals connected to the property, as having important historical associations with the development of Sacramento youth baseball. Architecturally, the property does not exhibit distinguishable characteristics for its type, period or method of construction. The building and structure on the property served a utilitarian requirement for the baseball organization. There is no substantial evidence that the property will yield information important to history. The property has lost integrity of design, materials, feeling and association. This, combined with the absence of significance, makes the building ineligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Places or the Sacramento Register. The demolition of the structure, and development of the site, would have a less-than-significant effect on these resources.

A cultural resources records search was conducted at the North Central Information Center and the results were compiled on January 18, 2011 (SAC-11-06). No previous surveys were conducted within the proposed project boundaries and only two surveys were conducted within 1/8 mile of the proposed project area. An archaeological survey was conducted in 1992 at the southwest corner of the intersection of Freeport and Florin and only identified the historic Walnut Grove Branch Line of the Southern Pacific Railroad (#3861). This resource is located outside of the proposed project area (and is separated from the project area by Freeport Boulevard). A 2010 evaluation of nearby William S. Chorley Park found that property did not appear to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (#34-4265).

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR-1 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.

- CR-2 If a Native American site is discovered, the evaluation process shall include consultation with the appropriate Native American representatives.

If Native American archeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified 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.

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.

- CR-3 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><u>5.GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u></p> <p>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

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Surface faulting or ground rupture tends to occur along lines of previous faulting. The nearest fault is the Foothill Fault System, located approximately 23 miles east of the project site. Since previously identified fault lines are not within or near the project site, the possibility of fault rupture is negligible within the site, but in the event of an earthquake on a nearby fault, the project site could experience ground shaking. The California Geological Survey (CGS) probabilistic seismic hazards maps shows that the seismic ground-shaking hazard for the city is relatively low, and is among the lowest in the State. Nonetheless, the State of California provides minimum standards for structural design and site development through the California Building Code (CBC – California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 2).

The 2007 CBC, effective January 1, 2008, is based on the current (2006) International Building Code and contains substantial enhancement of the sections dealing with fire safety, equal access for disabled persons, and environmentally friendly construction. The City's enforcement of its Building Code ensures the project would be consistent with the CBC.

State and local regulations require design-level geotechnical investigations for the foundations of any structure for human occupancy proposed at the project site, including specific recommendations to reduce or eliminate post-construction settlement. The design-level geotechnical investigation for the project would be reviewed by the City for compliance with existing building codes and ordinances. Implementation of the recommended site preparation activities would be enforced through inspection by the City.

Before construction of the proposed project, the City Building Code requires a site-specific soils report that identifies any potentially unsuitable soil conditions (such as expansive, liquefiable, or compressive soils) and contains appropriate recommendations for foundation type and design criteria, including provisions to reduce the effects of these soils. The recommendations made in the geotechnical report prepared for the project for ground preparation and earthwork would be incorporated in the construction design. The soils evaluations must be conducted by registered soil professionals, and the measures to eliminate inappropriate soil conditions must be applied. The design for soil support of foundations must conform to the analysis and implementation criteria described in the City's Building Code.

Compliance with the above regulations and permit processes would ensure that the underlying soil conditions are identified through geotechnical investigation and that appropriate design features are included to reduce or eliminate post-construction settlement due to ground shaking or liquefaction. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that impacts related to groundshaking, liquefaction, expansive soils or subsidence would not be significant. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death due to rupture of a known earthquake fault.

The project site is level, so there would be no impact related to the possibility of landslides.

The proposed project is not expected to create substantial erosion or loss of topsoil because the project site is level, so the water erosion hazard is considered low. However, construction activities would disturb soils, which could lead to erosion. In addition, post-construction changes to drainage patterns on the project site could lead to erosion. The following regulations control construction-related activities with regard to erosion.

The State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SWRCB) permits all regulated construction activities under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Order No.2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAR000002) adopted September 2, 2009. The project's construction activities would be required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Compliance activities under this ordinance include preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan that identifies and implements a variety of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce the potential for erosion or sedimentation. BMPs are intended to reduce impacts to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP), a standard created by Congress to allow regulators the flexibility necessary to tailor programs to the site-specific nature of municipal stormwater discharges. Regulations do not define a single MEP standard, but reducing impacts to the MEP generally relies on BMPs that emphasize pollution prevention and source control, with additional structural controls, as needed.

The proposed project would be required to connect to the sewer system and would not include the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems that would be limited by local soils.

Impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant with implementation of existing State of California or City of Sacramento regulations related to the design-controllable aspects of building foundation support, protection from seismic ground motion, and soil or slope instability. These regulations require that project designs reduce potential adverse soils, geology, and seismicity effects to less than significant levels. The project applicant must demonstrate that the project complies with applicable regulations before permits for project construction would be issued.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None 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
<p><u>7. HAZARDS</u></p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?</p>			X
<p>B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?</p>		X	
<p>C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?</p>			X

Existing Regulations

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

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).

Question B

A small structure is located on the project site. The structure was apparently used at one time as a snack bar. The regulations identified above regarding asbestos surveys and demolition controls would ensure that no significant effects would result in the event the structure is demolished. A Phase I environmental site assessment was conducted for the project site. The review revealed no evidence of historical recognized environmental conditions, and no evidence of current recognized environmental conditions. The project site was at one time in agricultural use and, since approximately 1961, was used as a baseball field for a little league. (See discussion of cultural resources, above.)

Based on the apparent age of the snack bar structure on the site, it is possible that asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint are present. Compliance with air district regulations, including completion of surveys for asbestos and lead-containing materials, would ensure that any impacts would be less than significant. The Phase I examination also identified abandoned railroad ties on the project site, and these could be subject to requirements for special disposal. To ensure that these materials are properly handled, Mitigation Measure Haz 1, below, requires that the applicant provide written confirmation of completion of required reports and appropriate disposal prior to the issuance of building permits for the project. This mitigation would reduce any potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Question C

Site grading would be minimal, and no dewatering would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Haz 1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit written identification and confirmation of all reports required relating to potentially hazardous materials on the project site, including reports required by the air district relating to asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint, compliance with applicable regulations relating to identification and disposal of all such materials, and appropriate disposal of railroad ties that are located on the project site.

FINDINGS

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

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

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

None.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

The Master EIR includes a discussion of water quality and discharges of stormwater from sites within the City, and that discussion is incorporated here by reference. See Master EIR, pages 6.7-13 and following. One of the most important of the features is the requirement that the applicant comply with the point discharge requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. As part of the project, the applicant will be required to construct an on-site ~~water detention~~ stormwater quality and detention facility to moderate downstream flows of stormwater, and to treat runoff from the site to improve water quality prior to its discharge to the City's stormwater system.

The City's grading ordinance (City Code Chapter 15.88) regulates development conditions to prevent erosion, and prevents pollution of watercourses with sediments and other materials. In addition, the City's Department of Utilities implements policies and guidelines regulating grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage design, inspection and permitting for grading and construction.

Project conditions will require the applicant to reserve easements for water and drainage facilities, and for surface water storm drainage. The applicant will be required to construct a drainage main extension to the satisfaction of the City for a portion of the stormwater flow, and the remaining flow will be diverted to a ditch on the east side of Freeport Boulevard. The construction of an on-site water detention facility will moderate flows and avoid any significant effects on stormwater facilities.

QUESTION B

The project site is located in X (shaded) flood zone. This designates an area of moderate flood hazard, usually the area between the limits of the 100-year and 500-year floods. Development of the site would not result in any new significant environmental effect.

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
9. <u>NOISE</u>			
Would the project:			
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?		X	
B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L _{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project?		X	
C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance?			X
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?			X
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?			X
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?			X

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A-C

The major noise sources in the area are from traffic on Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road, and from overflights by private aircraft due to the proximity of the Sacramento Executive Airport to the north of the site.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate noise due to grading and construction activities. This is a temporary impact. The City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance (City Code Title 8, Chapter 8.68 et seq.) exempts construction-related noise if the construction takes place 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. Operations outside of these hours would be subject to the limits set forth in the ordinance. The project would not include construction activities that could generate significant ground vibration, such as pile driving. The project would not result in any additional significant environmental effect due to noise.

The proposed project would subdivide the site into five parcels. The project includes construction and operation of a retail pharmacy store at the corner of Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road, and anticipated development in the future includes restaurants, retail spaces and office buildings.

The residences east of the project site would be exposed to traffic and other noise generated by

the office and retail project. Noise typically attributable to these sources, and the resulting noise impacts to existing noise-sensitive land uses, include mechanical building equipment, landscape maintenance and parking lot noise.

Mechanical building equipment: Mechanical building equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems) in use at the proposed buildings could result in noise levels of approximately 90 dB at 3 feet from the source (EPA 1971). Typically, these mechanical equipment systems are shielded from direct public exposure, with a substantial reduction in noise transmitted to the surrounding environment. Such units are usually housed on rooftops, in equipment rooms or in exterior enclosures, but if not shielded, their operation could result in noise levels of 65 dB at 50 feet. (EPA 1971). Any existing residential dwelling located within 50 feet of such an un-shielded mechanical system could experience noise levels that exceed the City's hourly noise standard for residential uses during the daytime hours and even more so during the nighttime when the standard is stricter. Any such occurrence would be a significant impact.

Landscape maintenance: Landscape equipment such as leaf blowers, lawn mowers, edgers and trimmers associated with maintenance of the proposed project would contribute to long-term increases in ambient noise levels at the residences to the west of the project site. Such equipment could result in noise levels that range from approximately 80 to 90 dBA at 3 feet (EPA 1971). Based on the maximum noise level of 90 dBA at 3 feet and assuming a noise attenuation of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source, landscape maintenance equipment could result in exterior noise levels of approximately 65 dBA at 50 feet. Even though maintenance activities would be intermittent and of limited duration (e.g., less than 1 to 2 hours per day during the daytime) such activities could still exceed the City's daytime noise standards at nearby residential dwellings. Any such occurrence would represent a significant impact.

The proposed project includes construction of a 6-foot high masonry wall at the project's eastern and southern boundaries that abut residential uses. The wall would shield neighboring residences from noise generated by the parking lot, and at least some of the mechanical equipment that would be installed as part of the project.

While the masonry wall would substantially reduce noise associated with mechanical equipment and landscape maintenance, noise levels could exceed the threshold levels established by the City. The mitigation measures Noise 1 and Noise 2, set forth below, would ensure that mechanical equipment is shielded, and that landscape maintenance hours are restricted.

Once constructed, the proposed project would generate noise primarily due to arriving and departing automobiles. According to the methodology obtained from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for prediction of parking facility-related noise, a parking lot with a maximum hourly traffic volume of approximately 1,000 vehicles per hour with entering or exiting the parking lot would result in peak hour average noise of approximately 56 dBA Leq at 50 feet and daily CNEL/Ldn levels (most sensitive noise standard) of 63 dBA at 50 feet. (South 65th Street Area Plan Draft EIR, pp. 5.1-17, 18)

The proposed project at buildout would include approximately 310 parking spaces, and would generate approximately 143 a.m. peak hour trips and 242 p.m. peak hour trips. The vehicle activity at the project site would be substantially less than the conditions discussed in the FTA data, and the noise generated by the project activity would, therefore, be less than the levels indicated by the FTA. In addition, the project would construct a 6-foot high masonry wall at the eastern and southern project boundaries, thus reducing the noise levels received by the affected residences by approximately 6 decibels. Based on the noise level that could be generated by the parking lot activities, and the construction of a noise barrier, the noise from parking lot activities would be below the thresholds established by the City, and would be ***less than significant***.

The uses anticipated at buildout of the site would generate some truck deliveries, but would not be of sufficient size to require loading docks. Office uses do not require substantial deliveries, and the retail and restaurant uses would be served by occasional tractor-trailer or smaller truck deliveries. Residences in the project vicinity are affected by current ambient noise levels generated by traffic along Freeport Boulevard and Florin Road. The southernmost retail location is approximately 60 feet from the closest property line of a neighboring residence.

Circulation of delivery trucks would generate noise, but the noise would be reduced by the effect of distance to the neighboring residences, and the 6'-high concrete masonry wall that would shield the neighboring residences from the noise source, reducing noise levels by approximately 6 decibels. Office buildings located along the south and eastern portions of the project site would provide screening from noise generated by site activities and Florin Road.

Noise would also be generated by the speakers used for communication with customers using the drive-through facility at the pharmacy. Future uses on the site could include a drive-through restaurant, but the site plan and location of speakers is unknown at this time.

New commercial uses would increase noise and vibration levels in the vicinity consistent with other similar commercial uses already developed in the area. Sources include additional vehicle trips on local and arterial streets, outdoor activities and drive-thru speakers. In the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the McDonald's Restaurant in the Pocket Area (2003), to quantify the noise levels from drive-thru vehicle trips and speaker usage, Bollard & Brennan, Inc. used noise level data collected at various fast food drive-thru locations in the Sacramento area to quantify noise levels from drive-thru vehicle trips and speaker usage. The EIR concluded that the maximum noise levels from drive-thru speakers and vehicles parked at the speaker location were 65 dB at 25 feet and 70 dB at 5 feet. Median levels were measured to be approximately 10 dB lower than maximum noise levels.

The drive-through proposed at the retail pharmacy would adjoin the building, and outdoor speakers would be enclosed within structural features of the building. The speakers would be located approximately 380 feet from the nearest residential property line. Based on the estimated noise level of the speakers, attenuation of noise over the intervening distance, and the noise attenuation resulting from the required masonry wall, the noise level generated at the property line would be less than the required 55 decibels. This would comply with the City's noise ordinance, and the resulting noise would be less than significant.

The only physical development proposed as part of the project is on Parcel 1. The applicant has provided general descriptions of uses that could be proposed for the remaining parcels created by the tentative map, and at least one of the parcels could be improved with a drive-through restaurant. The location of the building, drive-through lanes and speakers is unknown at this time, but it is estimated that the outdoor speaker used at the site would be approximately 230 feet from the nearest residential property line. Based on the approximate noise levels of outdoor speakers, distance to residential property lines and noise attenuation provided by the required masonry wall, the noise levels could be significant, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with proper design. In order to ensure that the appropriate design is included in any future project, Mitigation Measure Noise 3 requires that the applicant submit confirmation from a qualified noise consultant that the project as designed will comply with the City's noise ordinance. This confirmation shall be submitted prior to issuance of building permits for the site. This mitigation reduces the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

QUESTIONS D-F

The project site is level, and no buildings have been proposed that would require unusual construction techniques such as pile-driving that would cause substantial vibration. No operations have been proposed that could generate substantial levels of vibration. There would be no additional significant environmental effects.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- N-1 All mechanical building equipment, including heating, air conditioning and ventilating equipment and other mechanical equipment, shall be completely screened.
- N-2 Landscape maintenance activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- N-3 Prior to issuance of building permits for any use on Parcels 2 through 5, inclusive, of the project site that includes a drive-through facility, the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a qualified noise consultant that the noise emitted at the project property line adjoining residences by any outside speaker used for communicating with customers will be within the applicable limit set forth in the City's noise ordinance.

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

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

The proposed project is consistent with the general plan and land use designations for the project site. Impacts of development that could be anticipated pursuant to the general plan were evaluated in the Master EIR certified in March 2009. Cumulative effects of development on public services were discussed and evaluated. See Master EIR Chapter 6.10.

The project site is served by the City of Sacramento Police Department and Fire Department. The Police Department participates in project site design, and the project would be consistent with the principles of Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) is a multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through the design of project sites. CPTED principles relate to multiple aspects of site design, including lighting and visibility. These actions will ensure that the site design minimizes enforcement activity and the resulting burden on police services.

Building constructed on the project site would comply with the current Uniform Building Code, which include the installation of sprinklers. The site would be served with adequate water capacity to support fire suppression action if required.

City police and fire services have developed long-range staffing plans and funding. The project is consistent with the general plan, and development of the site has been taken into account in such planning.

No residences will be constructed as part of the project. Any impact on schools would be negligible.

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. <u>RECREATION</u> 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

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 required.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

The project includes a tentative map to create five parcels, and approval of a retail pharmacy on one of the resulting parcels. No development is proposed for the remaining parcels. The City has implemented development fees that are used to support parks and recreational facilities in the community. Payment of the impact fees is required at the time of application for building

permits.

The project does not include any residences, and would not result in any direct effect on parks or recreational facilities in the City. The payment of the impact fees would be sufficient to avoid any additional significant effects on these 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. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION 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>			
<p>D) Transit: adversely affect public transit operations or fail to adequately provide for access to public?</p>			X

E)	Bicycle facilities: adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle?			X
F)	Pedestrian: adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians?			X

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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

The City Department of Transportation prepared a traffic study for the proposed project. See Traffic Impact Study, Attachment 8.

The following facilities are included in the traffic impact analysis:

Intersections

1. Florin Road and South Land Park Drive
2. Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard
3. Florin Road and Amherst Street

A Level of Service (LOS) analysis was conducted for the above facilities for both weekday AM and PM peak-hours for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing plus Phase 1 Conditions
- Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions

The project would be constructed in several phases. Phase 1 of the project would include the 16,500 square feet of a CVS Pharmacy located at the southeast corner of Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard. The Project Buildout would consist of the CVS Pharmacy, a fast food restaurant, retail, medical office, and restaurant as described in the project description section.

Phase 1 of the proposed project will consist of a 16,500 square feet CVS pharmacy retail store. The project site is anticipated to have a consequent development of retail (15,150 square feet), fast food restaurant (3,100 square feet), restaurant (5,900 square feet), and medical office (20,500 square feet). The proposed project site is generally bound by Florin Road on the north, Freeport Boulevard on the west, commercial and residential parcels adjacent to Amherst Street on the east and south. The project location is shown in **Figure 1**.

Access to the site is proposed to be provided via one driveway on Florin Road and two driveways on Freeport Boulevard. The proposed driveway on Florin Road will provide right-in and right-out access to and from the site and a left turn into the site. A raised median is proposed to be constructed along Freeport Boulevard. It will provide a left-in access to the site and prevent the left-out movement from the site at the northern driveway. The southern driveway on Freeport Boulevard will provide only right-in and right-out access to and from the site. The project site is shown in **Figure 2**.

The following two scenarios were analyzed in the traffic study:

Phase 1: Construction of CVS Pharmacy only.

Project Buildout: The entire project including CVS Pharmacy, fast food restaurant, retail, medical office, and restaurant.

Study Area

The study area was selected based on the project's expected travel characteristics (i.e. project location and amount of project trips) as well as facilities susceptible to being impacted by the project.

The following is a list of intersections selected for the analysis:

1. Florin Road and South Land Park Drive
2. Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard
3. Florin Road and Amherst Street
4. Traffic analysis at the proposed three driveways is also included in this study

The number of trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed project was derived using trip generation data included in the *Trip Generation, 8th Edition*, and *Trip Generation Manual, 2nd*

Edition, both published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The initial phase, which includes the retail pharmacy, would generate 30 peak trips during the a.m. peak hour, and 116 trips in the p.m. peak hour. At buildout the project would generate 143 a.m. peak hour trips, and 242 p.m. peak hour trips. (See Traffic Impact Study, Tables 3 and 4) The traffic study assigned the new trips to area roadways, and analyzed the impact on operations using the City's thresholds of significance.

Questions A and B

Construction of the proposed project will include disruptions to the transportation network near the site, including the possibility of temporary lane closures, street closures, sidewalk closures, and bikeway closures. Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access may be disrupted. Heavy vehicles will access the site and may need to be staged for construction. These activities could result in degraded roadway operating conditions. As a result, construction activities could result in a **significant impact**. The mitigation measure identified below, which requires the preparation of a construction traffic management plan based on project plans as submitted, would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.

Given the high AM and PM peak hour volumes at Florin Road and the amount of traffic the proposed project would generate, the traffic analysis indicated that the westbound queue from the Freeport Boulevard/Florin Road intersection consistently extends beyond the beyond the available storage length during the AM and PM peak hours and build up cumulative conditions. If the area in front of the driveway is not kept clear, vehicles attempting to enter the project driveway from westbound Florin Road will rapidly queue back into Florin Road mainline or would conflict with the high speed, high volume eastbound traffic, which would impair the roadway operations and lead to a traffic hazard. Therefore this is considered a **significant impact**. *Mitigation Measure T 2* By implementing Mitigation Measure 2, the westbound left-turn queue at Florin Road/Freeport Boulevard intersection will be 206 feet and the impact would be less than significant (see Appendix B for queuing calculations).

The project is proposing to construct a raised median along Freeport Boulevard and two driveways to access the site. The northern driveway on Freeport Boulevard is proposed as right-in, right-out, and left-in access to the site. The southern driveway on Freeport Boulevard is proposed as right-in/right-out access to the site.

Freeport Boulevard adjacent to the project site is a high-volume, high-speed, four-lane arterial roadway with 420 northbound vehicles per hour per lane in the AM peak-hour, and 333 southbound vehicles per hour per lane in the PM peak-hour, traveling 54 miles per hour (85th percentile speed). The left-turn movement out of the project from the southern driveway at Freeport Boulevard is not safe and not desirable because it introduces a conflict with the northbound and southbound through traffic.

The existing northbound left-turn and U-turn traffic volume at Freeport Boulevard/Florin Road intersection would increase with the buildout of the site. **Table 7** presents the Existing and Existing plus Project Buildout queues for the northbound left-turn vehicles. A construction of the second left-turn lane is recommended as it would decrease northbound left-turn queues.

Right-turn movement has a significant effect on intersection capacity as well as roadway safety. Given the highway traffic volume and high speed at Freeport Boulevard, a separated right-turn lane is recommended at the northbound traffic at the Freeport Boulevard/Florin Road

intersection and two deceleration lanes are recommended at the proposed driveways along Freeport Boulevard.

Given the high AM and PM peak-hour volumes along Freeport Boulevard and the roadway safety concerns described above with the construction of the proposed project and proposed driveways along Freeport Boulevard, which would impair intersection and driveways operations and lead to a traffic hazard. Therefore this is considered a *significant impact*. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3 and as shown on Table 7, the left-turn queue length would be reduced to 125 feet and the impact would be less than significant (see Appendix B for queuing calculations).

Question C

Traffic generated by the proposed project at buildout would not adversely affect the operations of any freeway facility. The construction traffic and parking management plan would reduce impacts from construction activities to ensure that no such impacts occur. Any impacts would be less than significant.

Question D

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) provides public transit service within the project area. The following summarizes RT bus routes adjacent to the proposed project site:

- **Route 81** provides daily bus service connecting Florin Road & Riverside Boulevard bus station to University/65th Street Station bus stop, and provides direct access to the project site via Florin Road.
- **Route 247** provides weekday September to mid-June bus service connecting Florin Road & Gloria Drive bus station to 21st Street & Meadowview Road bus stop, and provides direct access to the project site via Florin Road.

The proposed project would generate additional ridership for public transit along the existing routes operated by RT. The additional ridership would not be substantial in relation to existing ridership, and any impact would be less than significant.

Questions E and F

The implementation of the project would include improvements to the pedestrian systems in the project area. These improvements include the construction of sidewalks and handicapped ramps at the southwest corner of the Florin Road and Freeport Boulevard intersection to provide connectivity to existing pedestrian facilities. As such, the implementation of the project would not result in significant impacts to the bicycle, pedestrian, or transit systems in the project area. Pedestrians would experience significant benefits with the implementation of the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Tran-1 Prior to beginning construction, a construction traffic and parking management plan shall be prepared by the applicant to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer and shall be subject to the review by all affected agencies. The plan shall ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained. At a minimum, the plan shall include the following:

- The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures
- Time of day of arrival and departure of construction vehicles
- Limitation on the size and type of trucks, provision of a staging area with a limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting
- Provision of a truck circulation pattern
- Provision of a driveway access plan so that vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle movements are maintained. The driveway access plan should include placement of steel plates, minimum distances for open trenches and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas
- Maintenance of safe and efficient routes for emergency vehicles
- Manual traffic control, if necessary
- Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures
- Provisions for pedestrian safety.

A copy of the construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to local emergency response agencies and these agencies shall be notified as least fourteen (14) days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct roadways. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to ***less than significant***.

Tran-2 Prior to issuing the first building permit, the applicant shall submit improvement plans and coordinate with the City to implement the followings:

- Allow U-turn movement on the westbound traffic at Florin Road/Freeport Boulevard intersection. The project applicant shall be required to provide the appropriate signs per the City of Sacramento, Traffic Engineering satisfaction.
- Proposed driveway at Florin Road shall be right-in/right-out only.
- Adjust the traffic signal timing at Freeport Boulevard/ Florin Road intersection. The applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Sacramento Traffic Operation Center to monitor and adjust the signal timing, when needed.
- The existing westbound left-turn pocket at Florin Road/ Freeport Boulevard intersection needs to be modified with the buildup of the project site to provide a standard left-turn pocket length.

T-3 Prior to issuing the first building permit, the applicant shall submit improvement plans and coordinate with the City of Sacramento, Department of Transportation to implement the followings:

- The project applicant shall construct a second left-turn lane on the northbound direction of Freeport Boulevard at Florin Road.
- The project applicant shall construct a northbound right-turn lane with the development of Phase 1 of the project (the CVS pharmacy store).
- The proposed southern driveway at Freeport Boulevard shall be right-in/right-out only.
- The project applicant shall construct a deceleration lane on both proposed driveways along Freeport Boulevard.

T-4 Prior to issuing the first building permit, the applicant shall submit improvement plans and coordinate with the City of Sacramento, Department of Transportation to implement the following:

- The project applicant shall construct a second left-turn lane on the northbound direction of Freeport Boulevard at Florin Road.
- The project applicant shall construct a northbound right-turn lane with the development of Phase 1 of the project (the CVS pharmacy store).
- The proposed southern driveway at Freeport Boulevard shall be right-in/right-out only.
- The project applicant shall construct a deceleration lane on both proposed driveways along Freeport Boulevard.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Transportation and Circulation 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>13. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments?</p>			X
<p>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?</p>			X

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 available.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS A AND B

The project proposes uses and densities that are consistent with the 2030 General Plan land use designations and zoning for the project site. The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community and is readily served by water and sewer services.

Water service to the site will require a water main extension and the installation of a second water point of connection. An existing 36" water main runs through the site, and the applicant will be required to provide a 15'-wide maintenance easement to avoid conflict with site activities.

The project site does not have existing connections to the City's sewer system. The applicant will be required to construct a sewer main extension to the system to the satisfaction of the City Department of Utilities.

The anticipated demands for utility services at the site have been considered in long-range planning for such services by the City. Cumulative effects of demand associated with development under the 2030 General Plan were considered in the Master EIR, and the project would not result in any additional significant environmental effects related to utilities that were not considered in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

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

The project would result in elimination of foraging habitat for the Swainson’s hawk. Mitigation would be required to replace habitat through credits at a mitigation bank or through purchase of appropriate land area. No cultural or historic resources have been identified on the project site, and mitigation would ensure that discovery of unknown resources during project development would be identified and appropriate steps taken regarding treatment.

QUESTION B

The proposed project is consistent with the general plan and zoning land use designations for

the project site. The development proposed would contribute to cumulative effects that have been identified and evaluated in the Master EIR prepared and certified for the 2030 General Plan. No additional significant effects have been identified for the project.

QUESTION C

The proposed project would develop the project site with retail, restaurant and office uses. None of the activities proposed would adversely affect human beings. Project impacts relating to air quality and hazards have been considered in the initial study. No significant adverse effects on human beings have been identified.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

X	Light and Glare	X	Hazards
X	Air Quality	X	Noise
	Biological Resources		Public Services
X	Cultural Resources		Recreation
	Energy and Mineral Resources	X	Transportation/Circulation
	Geology and Soils		Utilities and Service Systems
	Hydrology and Water Quality		
	None Identified		

SECTION V - DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial study:

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

January 28, 2011

Date

Tom Buford, Senior Planner
Printed Name

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*.