



**CITY OF SACRAMENTO**  
CALIFORNIA

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT

1231 I STREET  
ROOM 300  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2998

Environmental  
Planning Services  
916-808-5842  
FAX 916-264-7185

**ADDENDUM TO AN ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

*The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, make declare, and publish this Addendum to an Adopted Negative Declaration for the following described project:*

**P05-022 – T.G.I. Friday's and Sonic Restaurants** project consists of the necessary entitlements to subdivide a 3.2± acre parcel into two parcels and to develop a 7,308± square-foot restaurant on parcel A and a 1,900± square-foot fast food restaurant with drive-through service on parcel B (0.88± net acre) in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone in the Truxel 3 PUD in the North Natomas Community Plan Area. Specific entitlements include: Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a 3.2± gross acres (2.93± net acres) parcel into two parcels; Special Permit to develop a 7,308± square-foot sit-down restaurant in the Highway Commercial PUD (HC-PUD) zone; Special Permit to develop a fast-food restaurant in the Highway Commercial PUD (HC-PUD) zone; a Special Permit to develop a drive-through service facility in the Highway Commercial PUD (HC-PUD) zone; and a Special Permit to locate off-site parking for a fast food restaurant in the Highway Commercial PUD (HC-PUD) zone.

The City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, as identified in the attached Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This Addendum to an Adopted 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 Addendum to an Adopted Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15164 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, Planning Division, 2101 Arena Blvd., Suite 200, Sacramento, California 95834.

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

By: LC Sufer



**CONCLUSION TO PREPARE AN ADDENDUM TO AN  
ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

An Addendum to an Adopted Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164). The City has decided to prepare an Addendum in that none of the following findings necessary to prepare a Subsequent Negative Declaration have been made pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162:

1. No substantial changes are proposed to the project, which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration.

*The original Negative Declaration for the Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123), approved September 23, 2003 by the City Council, evaluated the entitlements for the creation of the Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development (PUD). The specific entitlements evaluated included: a **Development Agreement; Rezone** from 5.0± gross acres of Manufacturing Research and Development-20 Planned Unit Development (MRD-20 PUD) to 5.0± gross acres of Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC PUD); and **PUD Designation and Adoption of PUD Guidelines and a Schematic Plan** to designate the 5.0± gross acre site as a the Truxel 3 PUD and to include a PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines for the site. The original negative declaration (P00-123) identified potentially significant impacts regarding geology, air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were provided to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.*

*The proposed project consisting of developing a 7,308± square feet restaurant and a 1,900± square feet fast food restaurant with drive-up and drive-through facilities on 3.2± acres is consistent with the previously approved entitlements, land use designations, and zoning. Changes from the previously approved project include the specific configuration of building footprints and a detailed site plan for the site. Therefore, an addendum is being prepared for the development of the proposed project. Although the addendum provides additional information and evaluation, none of the new information and evaluations trigger a need for a Subsequent Negative Declaration. The new entitlements for the proposed project are within the scope of analysis of the previously approved entitlements and evaluation and will not result in any new potential environmental impacts or any more severe impacts than those previously evaluated and identified and proposed to be mitigated in the original Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123) Mitigated Negative Declaration.*

2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration.

*Some changes have occurred since the time the Negative Declaration was written. These changes include the payment of the required Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) fees and the rough grading of the project site and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD) approval of the Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County, 2004. These changes do not require major revisions of the original Negative Declaration. Additionally, the new information of the proposed project, merely clarifies the specific project information for the site. All of the new information and evaluations are considered to be technical changes and do not include any new impacts that have not already been discussed in the previous Negative*

*Declaration.*

3. No new information of substantial importance has been found that shows any of the following:
  - a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Negative Declaration and EIRs;
  - b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Negative Declaration and EIRs;
  - c) Mitigation measures previously found to be infeasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed project; or
  - d) Mitigation measures which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration and EIRs would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

*There are three sections of the Initial Study checklist that include revisions to the answers due to minor technical changes. However the proposed change, consisting of the specific project description for the development of the designated Highway Commercial uses will not result in any environmental impacts that were not previously identified in the original Initial Study/Negative Declaration. Since the time of the approval of the original negative declaration, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) approved updated guidelines for estimating and evaluating air quality impacts for projects within Sacramento County. A revised Air Quality section will provide updated information following the current SMAQMD guidelines.*

*The Transportation and Circulation section of the initial study is being updated to address the specific access and circulation elements of the proposed project and include information pertaining to the adjacent development project.*

*Since the approval of the original negative declaration, the NBHCP fees were paid for the proposed project area and rough grading has occurred. As a result the Biological Resources section of the Initial Study Checklist is being revised to provide updated information and requirements of the proposed project.*

*The proposed project description will not result in effects any more severe than what was evaluated in the previous Initial Study/Negative Declaration. This addendum is being prepared to address minor technical changes and additions to the original negative declaration. Mitigation measures originally adopted are still effective and applicable to the proposed project, except as revised in this addendum.*

## **T.G.I. Friday's and Sonic Restaurants (P05-022) Addendum to an Adopted Negative Declaration**

---

The following information is provided as a minor revision in the language of the original Initial Study/Negative Declaration for Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123). All responses to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines checklist questions, project impact analysis, and mitigation measures contained in the original Initial Study/Negative Declaration remain the same unless modified or replaced by the addendum information provided below.

### **PROJECT INFORMATION**

#### **File Number/Project Name:**

P05-022 / T.G.I. Friday's and Sonic Restaurants

#### **Project Location:**

The subject property consists of 3.2± vacant acres located at the southeast corner of Gateway Park Drive and Truxel Road in the Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the North Natomas Community Plan area of the City of Sacramento (APN: 225-0170-043).

#### **Existing Plan Designations and Zoning:**

The proposed project is located within the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) area. The 1986-2006 Sacramento General Plan Update designation for the site is Community/Neighborhood Commercial & Offices, the NNCP designation is Highway Commercial. The project site is zoned as Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC PUD) Zone.

#### **Other Project Studies/Reports/References:**

All documents are available at the City of Sacramento, Planning and Building Department, 1231 I Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814.

- City of Sacramento General Plan Update EIR, 1988
- 1986 North Natomas Community Plan SEIR, 1993
- City of Sacramento Zoning Ordinance
- Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123) Negative Declaration, 2003.

#### **Project Background:**

On September 23, 2003, the City Council approved various entitlements for the creation of the Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development (P00-123). The Truxel 3 PUD consisted of 5.0± gross acres located at the southeast corner of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard. The entitlements created the PUD with Highway Commercial land use designation and zoning.

#### **Project Purpose:**

The purpose of the proposed project is to obtain the necessary entitlements to develop

restaurant uses consistent with the existing zoning and land use designations for the site and consistent with the Planned Unit Development Guidelines

**Project Components:**

The proposed project consists of the necessary entitlements to allow for the development of a 7,308± square-foot sit-down restaurant and a 1,300± square-foot drive-in style fast-food restaurant with a drive-through. Specific entitlements include:

- A. Tentative Parcel Map** to subdivide a 3.2± gross acres (2.93± net acres) parcel into two parcels in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone;
- B. Special Permit** to develop a 7,308± square-foot sit-down restaurant on a 2.05 in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Develop (HC PUD) zone;
- C. Special Permit** to develop a fast-food restaurant on a 0.88± net acre parcel in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC PUD) zone;
- D. Special Permit** to develop a drive-through service facility on a 0.88± net acre parcel in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC PUD) zone;
- E. Special Permit** to locate off-site parking for a fast-food restaurant within a 2.05± net acre parcel in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone.

**Environmental Effects:**

This proposal has been evaluated under the City of Sacramento's Truxel 3 PUD Negative Declaration (P00-123). The purpose of the following analysis is to provide documentation for the environmental checklist, as well as to provide a factual basis for determining whether the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment beyond what has already been evaluated. The prior Negative Declaration evaluated the entitlements for the establishment of Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development. The current proposal will not create significant impacts over and above those previously evaluated with the original Truxel 3 PUD Negative Declaration (P00-123). The Negative Declaration is available at the Development Services Department, 2101 Arena Blvd., Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95834.

- Attachment A:** Vicinity Map / Location Map
- Attachment B:** Site Plans
- Attachment C:** Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123) Negative Declaration.

## Environmental Checklist Discussion

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

### Environmental Setting

The project site lies in the urbanized area of Sacramento County within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is subject to federal, state, and local air quality regulations. The project area lies within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state air quality laws. Both the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board classifies the SVAB as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Carbon monoxide (CO) is designated as unclassified/attainment (California Air Resources Board, 1998). Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County (SMAQMD, 1994). Ozone problems and localized CO increases in the Sacramento region resulting from traffic associated with SGPU buildout represent unavoidable significant adverse impacts (SPGU DEIR, Z-60 and Z-67). For the 1986-2006 SGPU, a Statement of Finding and Overriding Considerations was adopted by the City Council to address unavoidable significant adverse impacts to air quality.

The 1994 North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) includes an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS), the focus of which is on reducing emissions of ozone precursors and CO. The 1996 NNCP Final EIR describes the net increase in regional emissions of CO and reactive organic gases (ROG), which contribute to ozone, as being significant environmental impacts. The City Council found that these emissions are significant environmental impacts that would arise from the cumulative development of North Natomas in the absence of appropriate and feasible mitigation measures.

The 1986 NNCP EIR, certified in 1986, identified three mitigation measures related to air quality: 1) Implement requirements for the Air Quality Plan (Air Quality Mitigation Strategy) for

new developments; 2) Implement transportation control measures such as incentives for ride-sharing, transit, and bicycle use; and 3) Implement land use measures which would reduce the number of vehicle trips. Such measures include mixed land uses, which provide housing within walking distance of employment centers and development of housing with prices compatible with the salary structure of major local employers. Prior to approval of on-site development, the project will be required to submit an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS) and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Plan in compliance with those measures.

The 1994 NNCP sets forth additional air quality mitigation measures. The requirement of implementing an AQMS and a TSM Plan was restated as well as the following guiding policies that serve as mitigation measures:

- Development in North Natomas shall comply with the Federal and the California Clean Air Acts. (NNCP pg.48)
- Structure the community and each development to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips. (NNCP pg. 48)
- Minimize air quality impacts through direct street routing, providing a support network for zero-emission vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, and sizing streets suitable to the distance and speed of the traveler. (NNCP pg. 38)
- Provide commercial sites at transit stations/stops to make it easier for transit riders to shop on their commute rather than making a separate trip. (NNCP pg. 25)

The TSM Element and the required detailed AQMS of the NNCP were found to substantially reduce all the significant and potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from development of the NNCP area. The TSM element establishes a goal of 35 percent reduction in peak hour vehicle trips to assist in achieving an adequate level of service on North Natomas arterials. The AQMS establishes a community-wide goal of a 35 percent reduction in traffic and other related ROG to assist in achieving and maintaining federal ozone standards.

Roadways in the North Natomas area are projected to be moderately congested based on General Plan buildout. The highest predicted worst-case eight-hour and one-hour CO concentrations are at the interchange of I-5 and I-80. Violations of CO air quality standards are expected in a few other areas within the North Natomas area. Mitigation measures are not expected to reduce projected CO concentrations to a level below state and federal standards. Therefore, the above discussed Statement of Finding and Overriding Considerations would address unavoidable significant cumulative adverse impacts to air quality within the project area.

### **Standards of Significance**

*Ozone and Particulate Matter* An increase in short-term effects (construction) of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) above 85 pounds per day and an increase in long-term effects (operation) of either ozone precursor, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and/or organic gases (ROG), above 65 pounds per day would result in a significant impact.

*Carbon Monoxide.* The pollutant of concern for sensitive receptors is carbon monoxide (CO). Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County (SMAQMD, 1994). For purposes of environmental analysis, sensitive receptor locations generally include parks, sidewalks, transit stops, hospitals, rest homes, schools, playgrounds and residences.

Commercial buildings are generally not considered sensitive receptors. Carbon monoxide concentrations are considered significant if they exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard of 20.0 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard of 9.0 ppm (state ambient air quality standards are more stringent than their federal counterparts).

## **Answers to Checklist Questions**

### **Question A and B**

Operational Impacts: In order to assess whether mobile source emissions for ozone precursor pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), PM<sub>10</sub> and CO are likely to exceed the standards of significance due to operation of the project once completed, an initial project screening was performed using Table 4.2 in the *SMAQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (July 2004). This table provides project sizes for land use types which, based on default assumptions for modeling inputs using the URBEMIS2002 model, are likely to result in mobile source emissions exceeding the SMAQMD thresholds of significance for these pollutants. For projects approaching or exceeding the thresholds indicated in the table, a more detailed analysis is required. Those projects that do not approach or exceed the threshold levels in the table can be conservatively assumed not to be associated with significant emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, PM<sub>10</sub> and CO.

Projects categorized as "Restaurant, Quality" and "Restaurant, Fast, w/ Drive thru" land use development types are considered potentially significant at the NO<sub>x</sub> Screening Level for operational impacts at 56,000 square feet or more. The size of the proposed project is 8,600± square feet, which is well below the Table 4.2 criteria for restaurant uses. There are no sensitive receptors located within the vicinity of the project. Based upon the estimated emissions of the proposed project and the characteristics of the activities to be contained within the proposed facility, impacts to sensitive receptors are anticipated to be less-than-significant. Therefore, no potentially significant operational impacts are expected to air quality due to mobile source emissions for these criteria pollutants.

Project-Related Construction Impacts: The project was also screened for potential impacts to air quality due to construction of the proposed project, also using Table 4.2 in the *SMAQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (July 2004) as described above. For projects categorized as "Restaurant, Quality" land use development types, 152,000 square feet or more are considered potentially significant at the NO<sub>x</sub> Screening Level for construction impacts. For projects categorized as "Restaurant, Fast, w/ Drive thru" land use development types, 23,000 square feet or more are considered potentially significant. The size of the two proposed restaurants is 8,600± square feet, which is below the 23,000 square feet identified in the Table 4.2 criteria for fast food restaurants with a drive through. However, since the original project utilized methods for estimating emissions, which are now outdated, URBEMIS 2002 for Windows, Version 7.5.0, as currently directed by SMAQMD, was used to estimate emissions from the proposed project.

Construction-related emissions would result from site preparation and grading activities (rough grading has already occurred), construction worker commute trips, mobile and stationary construction equipment exhaust, and asphalt paving. Unmitigated emissions from both site grading and construction activities were estimated using URBEMIS 2002 for Windows, Version 7.4.2. The project assumed construction would occur over a twelve-month period. Table 3.1 in the *SMAQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment* (July 2004) was used for

the construction equipment assumptions, which include a grader, off highway trucks, tractors/loaders/backhoes, other equipment, a paver, and a roller. The maximum emissions per day were calculated based on a 12-month construction schedule, assuming 3.2± acres of total land area to be graded and developed.

Unmitigated Construction NOx emissions:

64.78 lbs/day in 2005

58.19 lbs/day in 2006

The calculated unmitigated NOx emissions do not exceed the construction-related threshold of 85 lbs/day. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with the proposed project are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

Additionally, construction would be required to comply with Sacramento City Code (Title 15.40.050 Construction Site Regulations, Control Dust and Mud), SMAQMD's Rule 403 on Fugitive Dust and Rule 435 on using compliant asphalt paving materials. Compliance with these codes and rules will further ensure impacts from construction activities will remain less-than-significant.

### **Questions C and D**

The project would not result in the alteration of air movement, moisture, temperature, or in any change in climate, either locally or regionally. The proposed project includes a two restaurant uses, which is consistent in height with the surrounding developments. A vast majority of the site will be covered with buildings or pavement (both concrete and asphalt). No increases in local temperatures are expected to result from the project. Landscaping will be provided on the perimeter and within the parking area of the project to comply with the City's Parking Lot Ordinance for 50% shading (Chapter 17.64.030 (H)), which will help shade the paved areas. A less-than-significant impact on climate is therefore expected.

The proposed project is not anticipated to create objectionable odors, as functions of the site will be contained within the facility. Once constructed all work areas will be contained within the building structure. The construction process could create objectionable odors, however, these odors would be temporary. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors over the long-term. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

### **Findings**

The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality.

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

### Environmental Setting

**Roadways.** I-80 and I-5 are the two major freeways that serve the project area. I-80 is an east-west, six lane interstate freeway that runs along the southern boundary of the project area. An interchange is located near the project area at Truxel Road. I-5 is a north-south, six-lane, interstate freeway two miles west of the site. Access to I-5 from the project site is via Del Paso Road or I-80. The major streets serving the site are Truxel Road (Natomas Boulevard) and Gateway Park Boulevard. Within the proposed project area, Truxel Road is a north/south six lane arterial and Gateway Park Boulevard is a four lane major collector. Adjacent and nearby intersections include; Truxel Road/Arena Boulevard, Gateway Park Boulevard/Arena Boulevard, Raley's Drive/Gateway Park Boulevard, Truxel Road/Gateway Park Boulevard, Truxel Road/I-80. A bikeway facility currently does not exist on the project area (Supplement to the NNCP EIR, pg. 4.3-2).

**Public Transportation.** Regional Transit (RT) is the major public transportation service provider within Sacramento County providing 20.6 miles of light rail service and fixed-route bus service on 77 routes covering a 418 square-mile area, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Existing bus routes in the project area are #11, 13, and 14, which have stops along Truxel Road

and/or Gateway Park Boulevard. RT currently is in the planning process of developing a Light Rail Line that will serve North Natomas and Sacramento International Airport. Several alignments are being considered along Truxel Road. Bus service is provided on 60-minute intervals from about 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. during weekdays and from about 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. One additional bus is added during the weekday AM peak period, resulting in 30-minute headways during that period.

**Bikeways.** An on-street bikeway is planned along Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site. A bike trail is designated over I-80 in the 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan.

**Parking.** There is presently no on-street parking allowed on Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard or existing parking within the project site, as the site is vacant.

### **Standards of Significance**

**Roadways:** An impact is considered significant for roadways when:

- The project causes the facility to degrade from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse
- For facilities operating at LOS D, E or F without the project, an impact is considered significant if the project increases the v/c ratio by 0.02 or more

**Intersections:** A significant traffic impact occurs under the following conditions:

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

**Bicycle Facilities:** A significant Bikeway impact would occur if:

- The project hindered or eliminated an existing designated bikeway, or if the project interfered with implementation of a proposed bikeway
- The project is to result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts

**Pedestrian Facilities:** A significant pedestrian circulation impact would occur if:

- The project would result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe increase in pedestrian/bicycle or pedestrian/motor vehicle conflicts.

**Transit Facilities:** A significant impact to the transit system would occur if the project-generated ridership, when added to existing or future ridership, exceeds available or planned system capacity. Capacity is defined as the total number of passengers the system of busses and light rail vehicles can carry during the peak hour of operation.

**Parking:** A significant impact to parking would occur if the anticipated parking demand of the proposed project exceeds the available or planned parking supply for typical day conditions. However, the impact would not be significant if the project is consistent with the parking

requirements stipulated in the City Code.

## **Answers to Checklist Questions**

### **Question A**

The proposed land uses of the project are designated in the General Plan and North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). In addition to previously prepared environmental documents for the SGPU and NNCP, the potential impact of the proposed land uses for the subject project have been analyzed in traffic impact studies for other projects in the area. Traffic Impact Studies were done for Natomas Market Place, Coral Business Center, and most recently for the Promenade at Natomas. The traffic generated from the proposed project will not result in any traffic impacts not already analyzed. In view of this, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a less-than-significant impact on the transportation and circulation system.

### **Questions B and E**

Public improvements required for the project will be designed to appropriate standards to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento, Development Engineering and Finance (DE&F) Division. Therefore, the creation of hazards is not expected and no mitigation is required.

### **Question C**

Existing road infrastructure provides adequate emergency access to the proposed project site. The project proposes a new driveway to provide emergency access. The project site will be designed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento Public Works Department and the Fire Department. Potential emergency access impacts are considered to be less-than-significant.

### **Question D**

All construction parking would occur on-site and would be short-term in nature. Parking would be required to comply with the City's Zoning Ordinance (Title 17, Chap. 17.64). The fast-food restaurant site is seeking a Special Permit to allow for off-site parking on the adjacent sit-down restaurant site, which contains enough spaces to allow for the additional parking. Parking required for the two sites total is 108 spaces (100 for the sit-down restaurant and 8 for the fast-food restaurant). The amount of parking proposed for the both sites totals 139 spaces, which is above the required parking for both sites. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact to on-site or off-site parking capacity.

### **Questions F and G**

Regular route schedules may be affected by slower clearance through the intersection due to construction vehicle obstruction. However, any delay would be temporary and of short duration, resulting in less-than-significant impacts to transit operations. Though Bus Routes #11, 13 and 14 travel adjacent to the project site, staging areas would be situated on-site and away from the transit stops preventing any interference with the transit system. Additionally, the developer would be required to comply with all applicable regulations for projects that encroach into the City's right-of-way, which would further ensure that impacts would be less-than-significant.

There are no rail, waterborne, or air transportation resources using the adjacent drainageways. RT currently is in the planning process of developing a Light Rail Line that will serve North Natomas and Sacramento International Airport. Several alignments are being considered along Truxel Road west of the proposed project. The proposed project shall dedicate in the form of an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (IOD) a 40-foot easement for light rail transit (LRT) uses or future light rail uses. Based on the nature of the project and compliance with City regulations, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, rail, waterborne, or air traffic transportation.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Findings**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant transportation/circulation impacts.

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

**Question A**

The proposed project is located in the at the southeastern corner of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard, which is located in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) area.

On May 13, 2003, the City of Sacramento approved the NBHCP and EIR/EIS. Then on June 27, 2003, the USFWS issued an ITP on the approved NBHCP and EIR/EIS. The City has an

existing CDFG 2081 permit that was amended July 10, 2003 based upon the recently approved NBHCP. In 2003, the required HCP fees were paid for the Truxel 3 PUD and subsequently the site was graded. However, all development within North Natomas is required to comply with the provisions of the NBHCP.

The proposed project is located within an area of North Natomas that would be required to comply with all provisions of the NBHCP. HCP fees have been paid and the site has been graded. It also appears that the site has been continually disturbed thereby, reducing the potential of special status species re-entering the site. Therefore, biological impacts associated with the proposed project are expected to be less-than-significant. However, the project is within the NBHCP, it is required to comply with the provisions contained within the NBHCP. Therefore the project may proceed subject to compliance with the applicable provisions of the NBHCP as summarized in the mitigation measures listed below.

### **Mitigation Measures**

BR-1. The project applicant/developer shall: (i) comply with all requirements of the 2003 NBHCP, together with any additional requirements specified in the North Natomas Community Plan EIR; (ii) comply with any additional mitigation measures identified in the NBHCP EIR/EIS; and (iii) comply with all conditions in the ITP's issued by the USFWS and CDFG.

### **Question B and C**


The proposed project site is on vacant land that has been graded. There are no trees located on the site that would meet the requirements of a Heritage sized tree. Since the approval of the original Negative Declaration and the previous entitlements, master grading has occurred on the subject site and there is not wetland habitat onsite. As a result, development of the proposed project will not create any additional impacts to locally designated species or wetland habitat over and above what was evaluated in the original Truxel 3 PUD (P00-123) Negative Declaration. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

### **Findings**

With the implementation of the NBHCP mitigation measure impacts to biological resources will be less-than-significant.




# ATTACHMENT A



Development Services  
Department


Geographic  
Information  
Systems

February, 2005



Vicinity Map  
P05-022  
T.G.I. Friday's & Sonic Restaurants  
North Natomas






Development Services  
Department

Geographic  
Information  
Systems

February, 2005




Zoning & Land Use Map  
P05-022  
T.G.I. Friday's & Sonic Restaurants  
North Natomas









**STATISTICS**


TGI RESTAURANT (293 SEATS)  
 PARKING REQUIRED  
 (1 STALL/3 SEATS)      120 STALLS

SONIC RESTAURANT (24 SEATS)  
 PARKING REQUIRED  
 (1 STALL/3 SEATS)      8 STALLS

TOTAL PARKING REQUIRED = 128 STALLS  
 TOTAL PARKING PROPOSED = 139 STALLS

NOTE: 19 COVERED STALLS AT SONIC RESTAURANT NOT A PART OF THIS PARKING COUNT.


**T.G.I. FRIDAY'S & SONIC RESTAURANTS**  
 TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA




Job Number: 2000-0001  
 Date: 11/11/00  
 Drawn: [Signature]  
 Revised: [Signature]  
 Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

**Revised by:**  
 Marnell  
 Becker

2277 Watt Ave., Second Floor, Sacramento, CA 95825  
 (916) 838-8300 FAX: (916) 838-8196




RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION FACING TRUXEL ROAD  
SCALE 3/8" = 1'-0"




LEFT SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 3/8" = 1'-0"

FRONT ELEVATION FACING GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD  
SCALE 3/8" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION  
SCALE 3/8" = 1'-0"



**MATERIALS & COLOR SCHEDULE**

1	EXTERIOR WALLS	3/4" CONCRETE
2	ROOFING	ASPH/FLT
3	FRAMES & TRIM	1" x 4" PINE
4	GLASS	1/2" CLEAR GLASS
5	WOOD	1" x 4" PINE
6	CEILING	1" x 4" PINE
7	FLOORING	1" x 4" PINE
8	PAINT	EXTERIOR: WHITE
9	INTERIOR	EXTERIOR: WHITE
10	ROOFING	ASPH/FLT
11	FRAMES & TRIM	1" x 4" PINE
12	GLASS	1/2" CLEAR GLASS
13	WOOD	1" x 4" PINE
14	CEILING	1" x 4" PINE
15	FLOORING	1" x 4" PINE
16	PAINT	EXTERIOR: WHITE
17	INTERIOR	EXTERIOR: WHITE
18	ROOFING	ASPH/FLT
19	FRAMES & TRIM	1" x 4" PINE
20	GLASS	1/2" CLEAR GLASS
21	WOOD	1" x 4" PINE
22	CEILING	1" x 4" PINE
23	FLOORING	1" x 4" PINE
24	PAINT	EXTERIOR: WHITE
25	INTERIOR	EXTERIOR: WHITE

REVISED  
P05-022  
Rec'd 6/21/05


**EXTERIOR  
ELEVATIONS**

Job Number	0505	Sheet	3
Date	06/21/05	Drawn	AM
Revised		of	

Rauschenbach  
Marvelli  
Becker

**FRIDAY'S**  
Active Restaurant Ventures  
TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
SACRAMENTO, CA

2277 Watt Ave., Second Floor, Sacramento, CA 95825  
916-486-1500 FAX 916-486-8395



REVISED  
 P05-022  
 Rec'd 6/21/05

**FLOOR PLAN**

Job Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Revised \_\_\_\_\_ of 2

**Rosenbach**  
**Marvelli**  
**Becker**


**FRIDAYS**

*California Restaurant Worldwide*


TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
 SACRAMENTO, CA

2317 Watt Ave - Second Floor - Sacramento, CA 95825  
 (916) 436-3500 FAX (916) 468-4586







FRONT ELEVATION FACING TRUXEL ROAD  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"




LEFT SIDE ELEVATION FACING GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"




RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"



TYPICAL CANOPY FRONT ELEVATION  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"



TYPICAL CANOPY SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 5/8"=1'-0"

MATERIALS & COLOR SCHEDULE	
1	WALL PANEL
2	WALL PANEL
3	WALL PANEL
4	WALL PANEL
5	WALL PANEL
6	WALL PANEL
7	WALL PANEL
8	WALL PANEL
9	WALL PANEL
10	WALL PANEL

REVISED  
P05-022  
Rec'd 6/21/05


EXTERIOR  
ELEVATIONS

Job Number \_\_\_\_\_ Sheet \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Drawn by \_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewed by \_\_\_\_\_  
of \_\_\_\_\_  
Rauschenbach  
Morrell  
Baker  
1111111111

TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA



2771 Well Ave. Second Floor-Sacramento, CA 95822  
916-488-8500  
FAX: 916-488-8506



TYPE	SYMBOL	QUANTITY	REMARKS
PLANTING	1	1	1
PLANTING	2	2	2
PLANTING	3	3	3
PLANTING	4	4	4
PLANTING	5	5	5
PLANTING	6	6	6
PLANTING	7	7	7
PLANTING	8	8	8
PLANTING	9	9	9
PLANTING	10	10	10
PLANTING	11	11	11
PLANTING	12	12	12
PLANTING	13	13	13
PLANTING	14	14	14
PLANTING	15	15	15
PLANTING	16	16	16
PLANTING	17	17	17
PLANTING	18	18	18
PLANTING	19	19	19
PLANTING	20	20	20
PLANTING	21	21	21
PLANTING	22	22	22
PLANTING	23	23	23
PLANTING	24	24	24
PLANTING	25	25	25
PLANTING	26	26	26
PLANTING	27	27	27
PLANTING	28	28	28
PLANTING	29	29	29
PLANTING	30	30	30
PLANTING	31	31	31
PLANTING	32	32	32
PLANTING	33	33	33
PLANTING	34	34	34
PLANTING	35	35	35
PLANTING	36	36	36
PLANTING	37	37	37
PLANTING	38	38	38
PLANTING	39	39	39
PLANTING	40	40	40
PLANTING	41	41	41
PLANTING	42	42	42
PLANTING	43	43	43
PLANTING	44	44	44
PLANTING	45	45	45
PLANTING	46	46	46
PLANTING	47	47	47
PLANTING	48	48	48
PLANTING	49	49	49
PLANTING	50	50	50
PLANTING	51	51	51
PLANTING	52	52	52
PLANTING	53	53	53
PLANTING	54	54	54
PLANTING	55	55	55
PLANTING	56	56	56
PLANTING	57	57	57
PLANTING	58	58	58
PLANTING	59	59	59
PLANTING	60	60	60
PLANTING	61	61	61
PLANTING	62	62	62
PLANTING	63	63	63
PLANTING	64	64	64
PLANTING	65	65	65
PLANTING	66	66	66
PLANTING	67	67	67
PLANTING	68	68	68
PLANTING	69	69	69
PLANTING	70	70	70
PLANTING	71	71	71
PLANTING	72	72	72
PLANTING	73	73	73
PLANTING	74	74	74
PLANTING	75	75	75
PLANTING	76	76	76
PLANTING	77	77	77
PLANTING	78	78	78
PLANTING	79	79	79
PLANTING	80	80	80
PLANTING	81	81	81
PLANTING	82	82	82
PLANTING	83	83	83
PLANTING	84	84	84
PLANTING	85	85	85
PLANTING	86	86	86
PLANTING	87	87	87
PLANTING	88	88	88
PLANTING	89	89	89
PLANTING	90	90	90
PLANTING	91	91	91
PLANTING	92	92	92
PLANTING	93	93	93
PLANTING	94	94	94
PLANTING	95	95	95
PLANTING	96	96	96
PLANTING	97	97	97
PLANTING	98	98	98
PLANTING	99	99	99
PLANTING	100	100	100

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	REMARKS
PLANTING	1	1	1
PLANTING	2	2	2
PLANTING	3	3	3
PLANTING	4	4	4
PLANTING	5	5	5
PLANTING	6	6	6
PLANTING	7	7	7
PLANTING	8	8	8
PLANTING	9	9	9
PLANTING	10	10	10
PLANTING	11	11	11
PLANTING	12	12	12
PLANTING	13	13	13
PLANTING	14	14	14
PLANTING	15	15	15
PLANTING	16	16	16
PLANTING	17	17	17
PLANTING	18	18	18
PLANTING	19	19	19
PLANTING	20	20	20
PLANTING	21	21	21
PLANTING	22	22	22
PLANTING	23	23	23
PLANTING	24	24	24
PLANTING	25	25	25
PLANTING	26	26	26
PLANTING	27	27	27
PLANTING	28	28	28
PLANTING	29	29	29
PLANTING	30	30	30
PLANTING	31	31	31
PLANTING	32	32	32
PLANTING	33	33	33
PLANTING	34	34	34
PLANTING	35	35	35
PLANTING	36	36	36
PLANTING	37	37	37
PLANTING	38	38	38
PLANTING	39	39	39
PLANTING	40	40	40
PLANTING	41	41	41
PLANTING	42	42	42
PLANTING	43	43	43
PLANTING	44	44	44
PLANTING	45	45	45
PLANTING	46	46	46
PLANTING	47	47	47
PLANTING	48	48	48
PLANTING	49	49	49
PLANTING	50	50	50
PLANTING	51	51	51
PLANTING	52	52	52
PLANTING	53	53	53
PLANTING	54	54	54
PLANTING	55	55	55
PLANTING	56	56	56
PLANTING	57	57	57
PLANTING	58	58	58
PLANTING	59	59	59
PLANTING	60	60	60
PLANTING	61	61	61
PLANTING	62	62	62
PLANTING	63	63	63
PLANTING	64	64	64
PLANTING	65	65	65
PLANTING	66	66	66
PLANTING	67	67	67
PLANTING	68	68	68
PLANTING	69	69	69
PLANTING	70	70	70
PLANTING	71	71	71
PLANTING	72	72	72
PLANTING	73	73	73
PLANTING	74	74	74
PLANTING	75	75	75
PLANTING	76	76	76
PLANTING	77	77	77
PLANTING	78	78	78
PLANTING	79	79	79
PLANTING	80	80	80
PLANTING	81	81	81
PLANTING	82	82	82
PLANTING	83	83	83
PLANTING	84	84	84
PLANTING	85	85	85
PLANTING	86	86	86
PLANTING	87	87	87
PLANTING	88	88	88
PLANTING	89	89	89
PLANTING	90	90	90
PLANTING	91	91	91
PLANTING	92	92	92
PLANTING	93	93	93
PLANTING	94	94	94
PLANTING	95	95	95
PLANTING	96	96	96
PLANTING	97	97	97
PLANTING	98	98	98
PLANTING	99	99	99
PLANTING	100	100	100

**NOTE:**  
 ALL PLANTED AREAS SHALL RECEIVE AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION.  
 MINIMUM OF 25% OF ALL TREES SHALL BE 2" DOX SIZE OR GREATER.  
 ALL OTHER TREES SHALL BE 1" DOX OR GREATER.  
 ALL SHRUB MATERIAL SHALL BE SEAL EXCEPT THOSE THAT ARE TYPICALLY AVAILABLE ONLY IN 1" DOXES.  
 LANDSCAPE INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS.  
 THIS LIST IS A GUIDE FOR PLANT SELECTION.  
 FINAL SELECTION IS TO BE MADE AT THE TIME OF REVIEW FOR BUILDING PERMITS.  
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT RESERVES THE RIGHT, UPON CITY APPROVAL, TO SUBSTITUTE PLANT MATERIAL DUE TO INHERENT AVAILABILITY, SHORTAGES, OR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTIONS.

- Symbol**
- TREES:
    - 1" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 2" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 3" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 4" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 5" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 6" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 7" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 8" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 9" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 10" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
  - SHRUBS:
    - 1" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 2" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 3" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 4" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 5" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 6" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 7" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 8" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 9" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 10" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
  - GROUND COVERS:
    - 1" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 2" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 3" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 4" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 5" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 6" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 7" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 8" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 9" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL
    - 10" DOX PAVANOLA - SPANISH BELL

REVISED  
 P05-022  
 Rec'd 6/21/05



**CROUCH & ASSOCIATES**  
 1271 INDA DRIVE  
 RYSEVILLE, CA 95975  
 LIC # 2227  
 (916) 752-6461

DATE: 07/27/05  
 SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"  
 DRAWING NO. C-18-02

L-1  
 OF  
 1

**T.G.I. FRIDAY'S & SONIC RESTAURANTS**  
 TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

ATTACHMENT C



PLANNING AND BUILDING  
DEPARTMENT

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

1231 I STREET  
ROOM 300  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2998

PLANNING DIVISION

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
SERVICES  
916-264-1909  
FAX 916-264-5328

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

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

**P00-123 – Truxel 3 Project** - The proposed Truxel 3 Project consists establishing a Planned Unit Development for developing approximately 2.8 acres of vacant land for the purpose of constructing Highway Commercial uses. The Truxel 3 project would provide highway commercial uses for both the North Natomas Community and travelers of I-80. Appropriate off-street parking would be required in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance for projects being constructed within the Planned Unit Development. Specific entitlements being requested for the proposed project include:

- A. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT;
- B. REZONE from 5.0± gross acres of Manufacturing Research and Development-20 Planned Unit Development (MRD-20 PUD) to 5.0± gross acres of Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC PUD);
- C. PUD DESIGNATION AND ADOPTION OF PUD GUIDELINES AND A SCHEMATIC PLAN to designate the site the 5.0± gross acre site as the Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development and to include a Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan and Guidelines for the site;

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

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Planning and Building Department, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, California 95814.

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

By: James Regan-Vincent 7/21/03

**Draft Initial Study/  
Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Truxel 3 Project  
(P00-123)**

**City of Sacramento  
Planning and Building Department**

**Prepared By:**  
Hughes Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
1909 Capitol Avenue, Suite 304  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 551-1700  
Contact: Elizabeth Hughes

**Prepared For:**  
City of Sacramento  
Department of Planning and Building  
1231 I Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 264-5482  
Contact: Scott Johnson

July 21, 2003

---

**TRUXEL 3 PROJECT, P00-123  
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared by the Planning and Building Department, Environmental Planning Services, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code, Title 63.

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is organized into the following sections:

**SECTION I. – BACKGROUND:** Page 1 – Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, and a project introduction.

**SECTION II. – PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Page 3 – Includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project.

**SECTION III. – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION:** Page 11 – Contains the Environmental Checklist form together with a discussion of the checklist questions. The Checklist Form is used to determine the following for the proposed project: 1) "Potentially Significant Impacts" that may not be mitigated with the inclusion of mitigation measures, 2) "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated" which could be mitigated with incorporation of mitigation measures, and 3) "Less-than-significant Impacts" which would be less-than-significant and do not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

**SECTION IV. – ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** Page 62 – Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have either "Potentially Significant Impacts" or "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated" as indicated in the Environmental Checklist.

**SECTION V. – DETERMINATION:** Page 63 – Identifies the determination of whether impacts associated with development of the Proposed Project are significant, and what, if any, additional environmental documentation may be required.

**SECTION VI. – REFERENCES:** Page 64 – Identifies sources consulted.

**SECTION VII. – PREPARERS:** Page 65.

**EXHIBIT 1 – SCHEMATIC PLAN**

**APPENDIX A – U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES LIST**

**APPENDIX B – OBSERVED PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES**

**APPENDIX C – MAY & ASSOCIATES, INC. HABITAT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**APPENDIX D – FOOTHILL ASSOCIATES, BIOLOGICAL SURVEY LETTER REPORT**

---

## SECTION I. – BACKGROUND

File Number, Project Name:

P00-123, Truxel 3 Project

Project Location:

The project is located within the western rural area of the City of Sacramento, in Sacramento County, California. The Project is located within the North Natomas Community Plan area. The project site is located at the southeast intersection of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard.

Project Sponsor and Contact Persons:

AKT Development Corporation

Eleni Tsakopoulos  
7700 College Town Drive, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95826  
(916) 383-2500

Planning and Building Dept.

Gregory Bitter, AICP, Project Planner  
1231 I Street, Room 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 808-7816  
gbitter@cityofsacramento.org

Scott Johnson, Environmental Planner  
1231 I Street, Room 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 264-5842  
SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Date Initial Study Completed: July 21, 2003

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Sacramento is the lead agency for the preparation of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Truxel 3 Project, proposed by AKT Development. The proposed Truxel 3 Project would provide highway commercial uses for both the North Natomas Community and travelers of Interstate-80 (I-80).

The design phase and the construction phase of the proposed project are funded by a private developer. The project requires review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),

and this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared for the proposed project. The City of Sacramento is the Lead Agency in the preparation of the IS/MND for the Truxel 3 Project.

It is believed at this time that the mitigation measures are feasible and, when implemented, would reduce the potentially significant impacts identified to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the City has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for this project.

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of this document. Due to time limits mandated by state law, your responses must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending on August 20, 2003.

Please send written responses to:

Scott Johnson, Assistant Planner  
Environmental Planning Services  
1231 I Street, Room 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 264-5842  
[srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org)

## SECTION II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### PROJECT LOCATION

The Truxel 3 Project is located north of the I-80/Truxel Road Interchange, within the western rural area of the City of Sacramento, in Sacramento County, California (see **Figure 1** and **Figure 2**).

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Truxel 3 Project would consist establishing a Planned Unit Development for developing approximately 2.8 acres of vacant land for the purpose of constructing Highway Commercial uses. The Truxel 3 project would provide highway commercial uses for both the North Natomas Community and travelers of I-80. Appropriate off-street parking would be required in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance for projects being constructed within the Planned Unit Development.


Specific entitlements being requested for the proposed project include:

- D. Development Agreement
- E. Rezone - to Highway Commercial
- F. Planned Unit Development (PUD) Establishment (PUD Guidelines and PUD Schematic Plan)

### PROJECT BACKGROUND

The City of Sacramento (City) is the lead agency for the preparation of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Truxel 3 Project, proposed by the AKT Development.

The Truxel 3 Development Guidelines, to be developed and approved, would establish the necessary criteria to promote quality design for any project developed on the site. Development of this project site would comply with these development guidelines, along with the North Natomas Development Guidelines and the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). All development would comply with the special permit process through the City of Sacramento Planning Commission, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. To the extent that these guidelines are more stringent than any city, state, or federal regulation, these guidelines shall control. To the extent that any city, state, or federal regulation is more stringent, the regulations shall control.




E:\Inroad\_3 Project\Figure\_1\_Vicinity.dwg 3/18/03 CMS



**Figure 1**  
Regional Vicinity

E-HITwellFig\_02\_Location at 3/16/03 CMS



HEC  
Figure 2  
Project Location

## **PROJECT PURPOSE**

A rezone of the site is necessary to make the zoning designation consistent with the NNCP designation of Highway Commercial (HC). The NNCP defines HC as "primary auto-dependent use . . . located at interchanges of the freeway system and provides services for highway users as well as the community. Service stations, restaurants, and lodging are appropriate uses for these areas." It is the City's policy to let individual landowners apply to rezone their properties consistent with NNCP land use designations when development applications are submitted (Supplement to the NNCP EIR, pg 4.2-2).

## **Relevant Prior Actions and Environmental Documentation**

Several previously prepared environmental documents provide relevant information for the proposed project. These include the 1987 City of Sacramento General Plan Update (SGPU) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the 2010 City/County Bikeway Master Plan and EIR, the 1986 NNCP and EIR, and the 1994 Supplement to the NNCP EIR. These documents are incorporated by reference and serve as the basis for information included in this Initial Study. Relevant information is summarized here as appropriate.

The proposed land uses of the project area are designated in the SGPU and the NNCP. All the significant environmental impacts associated directly and indirectly with these designations were identified and discussed in the 1987 SGPU EIR, the 2010 Bikeway Master Plan EIR, the 1986 NNCP EIR, and the 1994 Supplement to the 1986 NNCP EIR. These environmental documents identified significant unavoidable adverse impacts in the following areas:

- a. Hydrology, including an increase flooding potential, surface and groundwater quality, and changes in drainage;
- b. Loss of agricultural land (including agricultural lands and tree resources with wildlife habitat values);
- c. Air quality degradation;
- d. Traffic increases (not within the proposed project area);
- e. Loss of wetlands;
- f. Noise increases (due to traffic and Arco Arena);
- g. Loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat; and
- h. Water quality degradation.

In certifying the Final SGPU EIR, the NNCP EIR, and the 1994 Supplement to the NNCP EIR, the Sacramento City Council approved Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations to support the proposed land use designations of the project area. Section III of this Initial Study discusses the expected environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for the project, including reference to the discussions and conclusions in the above-mentioned documents. Impacts that were found in the previous analyses to be less-than-significant and not requiring mitigation are not discussed in much detail in this initial study.

## **PROJECT COMPONENTS**

The currently requested entitlements for the Truxel 3 project include a Development Agreement, Rezone, and Planned Unit Development (PUD) establishment. A Special Permit entitlement is required prior to development of the property.

The existing zoning of the site is Manufacturing, Research, and Development (MRD-20). This zoning designation is inconsistent with both the General Plan's designation of Community/Neighborhood Commercial & Offices (CNCO) and NNCP's designation of HC. The rezone request is required to bring the zone into conformance with the City's current intended use for the site as defined by the General Plan and NNCP. The proposed zoning for the site is HC.

### **Roadway Improvements**

Public Improvements required for the project will be designed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

#### *Class II Bicycle Lanes*

Bicycle lanes are planned for both Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard. The site will be designed to facilitate efficient circulation of automobiles without compromising the safety of cyclists.

### **Right-of-Way Acquisition**

No new right-of-way would be required in order to construct the project; however Regional Transit has requested a 40-foot easement on the south end of the project, 6-feet of which will overlap the 12.5-foot public utility easement (PUE).

### **Relocation of Utilities**

Truxel 3 Project construction activities may necessitate the undergrounding or relocation of utilities (i.e., electrical and telephone). Relocation of private utilities would be coordinated with the utility companies and be completed to their satisfaction.

The project will be required to construct a 12-inch water line along the east side of Gateway Park Boulevard to the northerly extent of the project area (approximately 850 feet).

### **Drainage Design**

During both the construction and operation phases of the proposed project, direct discharge of surface runoff to the adjacent drainages would be avoided. The proposed project site is approximately 380 feet north of the B Canal that connects with the East Drainage Canal near the I-80/Truxel Road interchange, approximately 980 feet east of the East Drainage Canal, and over 1.5 miles away from the Natomas East Main Drain, the West Drainage Canal, and the Main Drainage Canal. Drainage water would be allowed to flow off the elevated roadway and is unlikely to be concentrated. Roadway runoff would flow to the proposed curb and gutters and

into the storm drain system. The project is allowed to drain to Sump 20 and the existing 60-inch line in Gateway Park Boulevard. The applicant would be required to tap the existing storm drain line in Gateway Park Boulevard (manhole 901 or 902 as shown on the Drainage/Sewer 2000 maps, City of Sacramento) and construct a drain lead to the property line to serve the project. The project would be required to construct on-site water quality treatment features per the Department of Utility standards.

### **Erosion Control**

During grading and construction, the applicant would be required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Title 15, Chap. 15.88). At the time of future construction of the proposed project site, the right-of-way would be stabilized and landscaped in accordance with the City landscape guidelines and specifications. A landscape plan would be prepared and approved as part of future development applications.

### **Signage**

New signage would be constructed in the future, when the Special Permits are approved for development of the site. The design of all sign graphics, sizes, locations, etc. would be carefully considered in relation to the site architecture and landscaping as well as the Natomas area and would comply with the PUD Guidelines. Signage would also be required to comply with the City's Sign Ordinance (Title 15, Chap. 15.148). The objective of signage is to provide identity and information for tenants and users of the site while avoiding visual competition and clutter.

### **CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES**

Construction on the site would occur after a Special Permit is applied for and approved for development of the site. Future development would be consistent with the NNCP Highway Commercial (HC) designated uses and would provide services for highway users as well as the community. All grading and construction activities would be required to comply with all City and other applicable requirements. The Contractor would obtain all required licenses, permits and approvals necessary for performance of the work. Additionally, specific requirements or restrictions upon construction activities may be included in accordance with recommended mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

### **Construction Waste**

Liquid construction waste would be disposed of in a proper manner. Petroleum-based compounds would be contained and removed to an acceptable off-site disposal location. Wastewater from concrete and other construction activities would not be allowed to drain into the adjacent drainages in an uncontained or untreated manner. Washing of construction vehicles or other equipment in drainage paths to the creek would be prohibited. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required and would contain requirements for the cleanup of an accidental spill of petroleum-based products, cement, or other construction pollutants. The SWPPP would be prepared and approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to construction.

Solid debris from the construction site or from other activities associated with the proposed

activities would be kept out of the adjacent drainages.

### **General Stormwater Construction Permit**

The proposed project would comply with regulations involving the control of pollution in stormwater discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (Section 402(p), Clean Water Act). The City has obtained a NPDES permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under the requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The regulations, which apply to a new construction projects affecting more than one acre that would not involve dredging and filling of wetlands, are administered by the SWRCB on behalf of the USEPA. Under the program, the developer would file a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB to obtain a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit prior to construction of the proposed project.

The developer would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include information on runoff, erosion control measures to be employed, and any toxic substances to be used during construction activities. Surface runoff and drainage would be handled on site. Potential for erosion due to surface water flow would be primarily limited to embankment slopes and areas disturbed by grading during construction. Short-term, construction-related, erosion control would be readily available by means of Best Management Practices (BMPs) (i.e., use of erosion control barriers, synthetic slope covers, hydroseeding, etc.). Long-term erosion control, particularly for embankment slopes, would be available by means of establishing vegetation and controlling surface water flow (i.e., use of crown ditches, paved downdrains, vegetated swales, detention basins, etc.).

The SWRCB requires that the best available technology that is economically achievable, and best conventional pollutant control technology be used to reduce pollutants. These features would be discussed in the SWPPP. A monitoring program would be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures included in the SWPPP. The RWQCB may review the final drainage plans for the project components.

### **Construction Staging Area**

A central staging area, including a temporary office trailer and a parking area for construction workers and equipment, would be needed at the time of development of the proposed project. The staging area would be located on the proposed project site.

**DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW**

The following documents and maps are available for review at the Planning and Building Dept., Environmental Planning Services, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814:

- 1987 Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (SGPU DEIR).
- North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) and EIR (1986) and Supplement to the NNCP EIR, Adopted by City Council May 3, 1994.
- 2010 City/County Bikeway Master Plan and EIR.

### SECTION III. – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Truxel 3 Project area is contained within the *North Natomas Community Plan* area. The North Natomas Community is bounded by Elkhorn Boulevard to the north, I-80 to the south, the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal to the east, and the West Main Drainage Canal, Fisherman's Lake, and Highway 99 to the west. The North Natomas Community consists of 9,038 acres, 7,438 acres in the City of Sacramento, and 1,600 acres in the County of Sacramento. The community is located in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. According to the North Natomas Community Plan, "North Natomas is designated in the General Plan to be the City's major growth area for new housing and employment opportunities" (NNCP, Page 2).

The existing designated land uses surrounding the project site at the intersection of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard include Regional Commercial to the south and west that consists of the existing Natomas Marketplace and I-80, Employment Center 50/acre (EC50) and Employment Center 80/acre (EC80) to the north that consists of vacant land, and Employment Center 50/acre (EC50) to the east that consists of vacant land

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

Impacts to the physical environment resulting from the proposed project are discussed in

subsequent sections of this document.

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

The proposed project would not result in an alteration in the planned land use for the area, due to the proposed rezoning. The existing zone of the site is MRD-20 (PUD). This current zone designation is inconsistent with both the General Plan's designation of Community/Neighborhood Commercial & Offices (CNCO) and NNCP's designation of Highway Commercial (HC). No new right-of-way would be required in order to construct the project.

Rezoning the site to HC would bring the zone into conformance with the City's current intended use for the site as defined by the General Plan and NNCP. With the implementation of the proposed rezone, the zoning of the site would be consistent with the designated land uses. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact to land use is anticipated.

### **Question B**

The Sacramento area is one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world and contains extensive acreage of prime agricultural soils (SGPU DEIR, T-16); however, the project site is not surrounded by farmlands, and it is not anticipated to affect any agricultural resources.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on agricultural resources.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

## **FINDINGS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The North Natomas area has been one of Sacramento's fastest growing areas. Approximately 2,000 homes per year have been constructed in North Natomas since the year 2000.

Despite the relative newness of the Natomas area, census data showed demographics similar to those of the City and County. At build-out in accordance with the NNCP, population is expected to reach approximately 66,910 residents (NNCP, Page 14).

The proposed project site is undeveloped land that was previously used for agricultural production. No homes are located on the subject site. The site has never been designated for residential use in the General Plan or NNCP.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

**ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Questions A and B**

Housing would not be displaced as part of the proposed project. Because no areas designated as residential are involved, impacts to population and housing are not expected to result from the proposed project.

As discussed in the SGPU EIR, expected population growth in the North Natomas area alone is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts; however, adverse secondary impacts could occur (SGPU EIR, pg. E-19). These impacts and associated mitigation measures are discussed in the SGPU EIR and in this Initial Study under the appropriate resource sections. Therefore, impacts to population and housing would be considered less-than-significant.

The proposed Truxel 3 development project would not alter the location, distribution, density or growth rate of the human population of the area. The project would not affect existing housing, specifically affordable housing, or create a demand for additional housing. The proposed project would serve the population anticipated by the SGPU and NNCP.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

### **FINDINGS**

The proposed project would not result in impacts to population and housing.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Seismicity**

The *Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report* (SGPU DEIR) identifies all of the City of Sacramento as being subject to potential damage from earthquake groundshaking at a maximum intensity of VIII of the Modified Mercalli scale (SGPU DEIR, T-16). However, no geologic features such as faults or Alquist-Priolo special studies zones are known to occur in or near the project area (SGPU DEIR, T-3). An earthquake of intensity VIII could cause alarm; structural damage would be moderate depending on structural design. Currently, the City requires that all new structures be designed to withstand this intensity level, since the City is within Zone 3 of the Uniform Building Code's (UBC) Seismic Risk Map of the United States (SGPU DEIR, T-20).

**Soils**

According to Exhibit T-2 of the SGPU DEIR, the Truxel 3 project area is underlain by Holocene floodplain deposits (SGPU DEIR, Exhibit T-2). These recent floodplain and basin deposits represent the depositional regime of the area immediately prior to streamflow and drainage changes brought about within the last 135 years (SGPU DEIR, T-1). Floodplain deposits are unconsolidated sands, silts, and clays formed from flooding of the American and Sacramento Rivers, and are generally moderately to highly permeable. Exhibit T-4 of the SGPU DEIR further indicates that the project area correlates with the Sailboat-Scribner-Cosumnes soils. These are very deep, somewhat poorly and poorly drained soils that have a seasonal high water table and are protected by levees (SGPU DEIR, T-5).

The City has obtained a NPDES permit from the SWRCB under the requirements of the

Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in storm runoff. City NPDES permit requirements are further detailed in the water quality section of this document.

### **Regional Geology**

The project area is located within the Sacramento Valley, which is a part of the larger Great Central Valley. The Great Central Valley is a deep trough that extends 400 miles from the Klamath Mountains in the north to the Tehachapi Mountains in the south. The Sacramento Valley is drained by the American and Sacramento Rivers and their tributaries, which flow south and west toward San Francisco Bay. The site does not contain any unique geologic or physical features, as it is generally level with minimal variations in topography. The Natomas East Main Drainage Canal does not cross through the project area.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

### **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

#### **Question A**

The proposed project would not result in the exposure of people to geologic or seismic hazards. The proposed construction of the Truxel 3 Project would be performed to current UBC standards, which would minimize the potential for damage due to ground shaking. The incorporation of structural design features in the construction site that are capable of withstanding the forces associated with the maximum credible earthquake on active faults in the project vicinity would reduce the potential project-related impacts from seismic activities to less-than-significant levels.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact associated with seismic activities.

#### **Question B**

The proposed project would not involve significant changes in topography, as the site topography is generally level. Grading activities associated with project development are required to follow the requirements of the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Code 15.88.250). A grading permit shall be obtained from the Director of the Planning and Building Department according to the City Grading Ordinance (Title 15, Chapter 15.88). Improvement Plans shall be completed for the Department's review, and the plans shall be finalized in accordance with comments from the Director prior to the signing of the plans. An erosion and sediment control plan discussing BMPs to be implemented shall be submitted with these plans. Erosion controls, such as the use of a dust palliative where necessary and revegetation of areas exposed and disturbed during the course of construction, shall be implemented. Through standard City requirements, the Contractor will be required to use Best

Management Practices (BMPs; e.g., placement of hay bales, sediment fencing, or similar structures) to prevent inadvertent erosion and to prevent sediment from entering the drainage areas. The potential for soil erosion would be reduced through following the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Code 15.88.250) in addition to implementing appropriate BMPs. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact from erosion and unstable soil conditions.

Therefore, with implementation of BMPs and compliance with the City Code, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on erosion, changes in topography, and unstable soil conditions.

#### **Question C**

The proposed project should not involve groundwater pumping or dewatering, as proposed cuts would not be deep enough to encounter groundwater. If groundwater were encountered during excavation activities, the following measure would be required:

#### **MITIGATION MEASURE**

SSG-1. If groundwater were encountered during excavation activities, pumped water shall be channeled to an infiltration basin, located within an upland area of the construction activities and would eventually percolate into the groundwater. Upon percolation of all pumped water, the infiltration basin shall be backfilled and revegetated or developed per City and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

Therefore, with implementation of the listed mitigation measure, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact associated with groundwater pumping or dewatering.

#### **Question D**

There are no recognized unique geologic features or physical features that would be impacted by the construction of the proposed project. Drainageways do not cross through the project area. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact to unique geologic or physical features.

#### **FINDINGS**

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would result in less-than-significant impacts to seismicity, soils, and geology.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>4. WATER</b> <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>			
A) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			X
B) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?			X
C) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?			X
D) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?			X
E) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawal, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?			X
F) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?			X
G) Impacts to groundwater quality?			X

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Surface/Groundwater**

The North Natomas area, including the project area, is drained through a series of canals and pump stations (SGPU DEIR, J-3). Irrigation return flows and storm drainage flows are eventually discharged through to the Sacramento River through the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal, or by pumping from the Natomas Main Drainage Canal. The existing drainage canals cannot accommodate additional urban runoff from the surrounding area. In the NNCP area, construction of new major trunk line collectors and expansion of pumping facilities is being coordinated with development in North Natomas.

The aquifer system underlying the City is part of the larger Central Valley groundwater basin. Groundwater levels in the Sacramento area have been declining since 1940. The pattern of pumping has continued over the years, and the current rate of decline is about 1.5 feet per year (SGPU DEIR, W-9).

The project site is currently undeveloped with ground elevations ranging from 9.5 feet to 14.0 feet above mean sea level. Drainage of the site is via surface flows, south towards Truxel Road, west towards the East Drainage Canal and Gateway Park Boulevard. Along these areas there are inlets to existing underground storm drainpipes. Much of the existing rainfall is absorbed into the ground through infiltration and percolation.

Existing storm drainpipes receiving water from the site transport the water to Sump 20, (Detention Basin #9) located approximately 0.5 mile due south of the project site. Water is pumped from the detention basin at Sump 20 into the East Drainage Canal, where it eventually is pumped into the Sacramento River. Sump 20 was constructed in 1997 as part of the Gateway Park Community Facilities District (CFD) Drainage Improvements to serve the drainage needs of the Coca-Cola property, the Natomas Marketplace property, Raley's property, the Truxel 3 property, and the BNN & Properties to the north. Sump 20 mitigates the peak run-off and water quality requirements of the City of Sacramento for these properties.

### **Water Quality**

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

The water quality of the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal is affected by runoff from storm drains and illegal dumping at creeks and drainageways (SGPU DEIR, W-11). The Central Valley RWQCB has primary responsibility for protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters within the City. The RWQCB's efforts are generally focused on preventing either the introduction of new pollutants or an increase in the discharge of existing pollutants into bodies of water that fall under its jurisdiction.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared for the proposed project and would include information on runoff, erosion control measures to be employed, and any toxic substances to be used during construction activities.

The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board under the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in storm runoff. The general permit requires the permittee to employ BMPs before, during, and after construction. The primary objective of the BMPs is to reduce non-point source pollution into waterways. These practices include structural and source

control measures for residential and commercial areas, and BMPs for construction sites. BMP mechanisms minimize erosion and sedimentation, and prevent pollutants such as oil and grease from entering the storm water drains. BMPs are approved by Department of Utilities before beginning construction (the BMP document is available from the Department of Utilities, Flood Control and Sewers Division, 1391 35th Avenue, Sacramento, CA). Components of BMPs include:

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

### **Groundwater**

The sedimentary layers underlying the project area are part of a major aquifer system that extends throughout the Central Valley from Red Bluff to Bakersfield. This system is recharged in the project vicinity by the Sacramento, American, and Cosumnes Rivers and their tributaries and by the percolation of stormwater and water applied to irrigated crops. Groundwater levels in the Sacramento area have been declining at least since the 1940's (SGPU EIR, pg. W-9).

Groundwater and seepage impacts from development in North Natomas were determined to be significant and unavoidable in the Supplement to the NNCP EIR. These issues were addressed in the City's Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

### **Flooding**

Prior to the early 1900's, flooding occurred regularly in the Sacramento Valley (SGPU DEIR, W-3). Natural levees had developed along the creeks and rivers, but winter storms regularly caused overtopping of the banks and spreading of floodwaters across broad areas. Sacramento now has an extensive system of man-made levees and floodways, which protect most of the City from flooding.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) published Flood Insurance Rate Maps that delineate flood hazard zones for communities. The proposed project site is currently within an area designated as an X flood zone (updated in May 2000), an area outside the 500-year floodplain. The project was originally designated as an AR flood zone, which is applied to areas of the City, which have less than 100-year flood protection. However, the levees of the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal were raised and reinforced, and a LOMR was issued stating that the Natomas Basin has 100-year flood protection. A Conditional LOMR has also been issued for the North Natomas Comprehensive Drainage Improvements Project that would

add volume and pumping capacity to the East and West Drains in order to pull the adjacent areas out of the 100-year floodplain. With completion of these flood control projects, North Natomas has a minimum of 100-year flood protection, and the AR flood zone designation has been removed.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

### **Water Quality**

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

### **Flooding**

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would substantially increase exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

The proposed project would not result in substantial changes to absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff, as proposed construction activities are consistent with what was anticipated in the NNCP. Additionally, proposed construction, including the use of all weather surfaces, appropriately sized culverts, and sufficient drainage would accommodate and treat existing and any additional surface runoff. Impacts from the proposed project would not be greater than those anticipated in the NNCP EIR.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff.

### **Question B**

Due to the location of the proposed project in the Natomas Basin, it is not an area at risk of a 100-year flood. The project would not alter the course or flow of floodwaters. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on flooding hazards.

### **Questions C and D**

Construction related activities have the potential to impact water quality. The release of sediments, fuel, oil, grease, solvents, concrete wash, and other chemicals used in construction activities could impact water quality if allowed to enter adjacent drainages.

The majority of the project area is level and covered by soils that are not susceptible to erosion. Potential for erosion due to surface water flow would be primarily limited to embankment slopes and areas disturbed by grading during construction.

The project would comply with the City of Sacramento Code, Ordinance 15.88.250, Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control. Sedimentation controls would be implemented in order to lessen the potential for water quality impacts. Additionally, with the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required, potential for discharge into waterways from the project would be further reduced. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on surface waters, changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements.

### **Questions E, F and G**

As discussed in the Supplement to the NNCP EIR and in the SGPU EIR, development within the NNCP area would result in changes in groundwater quality and quantity within the NNCP area. The SGPU EIR states that groundwater quantity issues are addressed in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and County of Sacramento concerning water development and use within the urbanized areas of Sacramento County. Because groundwater withdrawals would be managed according to this MOU, impacts related to groundwater quantity would be considered less-than-significant (SGPU EIR, pg. W-14).

However, the Supplement to the NNCP EIR identified the potential for groundwater resources to be infiltrated by leaking chemicals. This would be considered a potentially significant impact and mitigation would be required. However, the site would be designed to applicable standards and regulations to prevent the infiltration of chemicals. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

Future development within the project area would require subsequent site-specific environmental review, including a review of potential water resources impacts and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures if applicable.

### **MITIGATION MEASURE**

No mitigation is required.

### **FINDINGS**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project site lies in the urbanized area of Sacramento County within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is subject to federal, state, and local air quality regulations. The project area lies within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state air quality laws. Both the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board classifies the SVAB as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Carbon monoxide (CO) is designated as unclassified/attainment (California Air Resources Board, 1998). Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County (SMAQMD, 1994). Ozone problems and localized CO increases in the Sacramento region resulting from traffic associated with SGPU buildout represent unavoidable significant adverse impacts (SPGU DEIR, Z-60 and Z-67). For the 1986-2006 SGPU, a Statement of Finding and Overriding Considerations was adopted by the City Council to address unavoidable significant adverse impacts to air quality.

The 1994 North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) includes an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS), the focus of which is on reducing emissions of ozone precursors and CO. The 1996 NNCP Final EIR describes the net increase in regional emissions of CO and reactive organic gases (ROG), which contribute to ozone, as being significant environmental impacts. The City Council found that these emissions are significant environmental impacts that would arise from the cumulative development of North Natomas in the absence of appropriate and feasible mitigation measures.

The 1986 NNCP EIR, certified in 1986, identified three mitigation measures related to air quality: 1) Implement requirements for the Air Quality Plan (Air Quality Mitigation Strategy) for new developments; 2) Implement transportation control measures such as incentives for ride-sharing, transit, and bicycle use; and 3) Implement land use measures which would reduce the number of vehicle trips. Such measures include mixed land uses, which provide housing within walking distance of employment centers and development of housing with prices compatible with the salary structure of major local employers. Prior to approval of on-site development, the project will be required to submit an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS) and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Plan in compliance with those measures.

The 1994 NNCP sets forth additional air quality mitigation measures. The requirement of implementing an AQMS and a TSM Plan was restated as well as the following guiding policies that serve as mitigation measures:

- Development in North Natomas shall comply with the Federal and the California Clean Air Acts. (NNCP pg.48)
- Structure the community and each development to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips. (NNCP pg. 48)
- Minimize air quality impacts through direct street routing, providing a support network for zero-emission vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, and sizing streets suitable to the distance and speed of the traveler. (NNCP pg. 38)
- Provide commercial sites at transit stations/stops to make it easier for transit riders to shop on their commute rather than making a separate trip. (NNCP pg. 25)

The TSM Element and the required detailed AQMS of the NNCP were found to substantially reduce all the significant and potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from development of the NNCP area. The TSM element establishes a goal of 35 percent reduction in peak hour vehicle trips to assist in achieving an adequate level of service on North Natomas arterials. The AQMS establishes a community-wide goal of a 35 percent reduction in traffic and other related ROG to assist in achieving and maintaining federal ozone standards.

Traffic originating in the North Natomas area produces approximately 1.0 percent of City-generated traffic emissions (SGPU DEIR, Z-16). Roadways in the North Natomas area are projected to be moderately congested based on General Plan buildout. The highest predicted worst case eight-hour and one-hour CO concentrations are at the interchange of I-5 and I-80. Violations of CO air quality standards are expected in a few other areas within the North Natomas area. Mitigation measures are not expected to reduce projected CO concentrations to a level below state and federal standards. Therefore, the above discussed Statement of Finding and Overriding Considerations would address unavoidable significant adverse impacts to air quality within the project area.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

For purposes of environmental analysis, sensitive receptor locations generally include parks, sidewalks, transit stops, hospitals, rest homes, schools, playgrounds, and residences. Commercial buildings are generally not considered sensitive receptors.

### **Ozone**

Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and reactive organic gases (ROG) are precursors to ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). Emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> above 85 above pounds per day (ppd) for construction and 65 ppd for operation would be considered significant. Emissions of ROG above 65 ppd for operation would be considered significant. There is currently no mass emission threshold for ROG for construction. In addition, violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for O<sub>3</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> precursors would represent a significant impact requiring mitigation. These include the one-hour standard for O<sub>3</sub> of 0.09 ppm, and the one-hour standard for NO<sub>x</sub> of 0.25 ppm.

### **Particulate Matter**

Violations of the CAAQS for respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) would represent a significant impact requiring mitigation. These include the 24-hour standard for PM<sub>10</sub> of 50 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, and the annual geometric mean of 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (275 lbs/day).

### **Carbon Monoxide**

CO concentrations are considered significant if they exceed the one-hour state ambient air quality standard of 20.0 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour state ambient standard of 9.0 ppm (state ambient air quality standards are more stringent than their federal counterparts).

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

Project-related air quality impacts fall into two categories: short-term impacts due to construction, and long-term impacts due to project operation.

#### *Construction Related Air Quality*

Construction-related emissions would include dust generated from site excavation activities. Emissions during grading and trenching are estimated below using the SMAQMD construction air quality formulas from the *1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook*. For the purposes of air quality analysis, the project is divided into two phases. The first phase examines the emissions generated from the preparation of the project (i.e., grading, trenching). The second phase analyzes the installation of asphalt and other construction activities (e.g., building, architectural coatings). **Tables 5-1 and 5-2** indicate the estimated emissions during the construction phases.

**TABLE 5-1**  
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS – PHASE I

Pollutant	Significance Threshold	Estimated Project Emissions	Estimated Mitigated Project Emissions
ROG	None	1 lb/day	1 lb/day
NO <sub>x</sub>	85 lbs/day	8 lbs/day	8 lbs/day
PM <sub>10</sub>	275 lbs/day	304 lbs/day	157 lbs/day

**TABLE 5-2**  
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS – PHASE 2

Pollutant	Significance Threshold	Estimated Project Emissions
ROG	None	13.7 lbs/day
NO <sub>x</sub>	85 lbs/day	22.8 lbs/day
PM <sub>10</sub>	275 lbs/day	1.7 lbs/day

Estimated emissions for particulate matter during the first phase of construction exceed SMAQMD adopted significance criteria. By implementing mitigation measures listed below, the estimated emissions values for particulate matter is reduced to a less-than-significant level. During the second phase of construction (asphalt installation), nitrogen oxide emissions have been estimated at levels below the SMAQMD threshold; therefore short-term impacts from NO<sub>x</sub> emission are anticipated to remain less-than-significant. Additionally, Construction would be required to comply with SMAQMD's Rule 405 on dust and fume control and Rule 435 on using compliant asphalt paving materials.

The small amount of short-term traffic generated by construction vehicles would not result in significant regional air quality impacts or "hot spots" at nearby intersections.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

- AQ-1. Exposed soil shall be watered with adequate frequency to keep soil moist at all times.
- AQ-2. Loads of haul/dump trucks shall be covered securely.
- AQ-3. Any exposed piles of dirt, sand, gravel, or other construction debris shall be enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily.
- AQ-4. All dirt and mud which has been generated from or deposited by construction equipment going to and from the construction site along neighborhood streets shall be removed at a minimum of three times per week.
- AQ-5. Equipment idling shall be kept to a minimum when equipment is not in use. No piece of equipment shall be left to idle in one place for more than 30 minutes.
- AQ-6. On-site vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces.

AQ-7. Revegetate disturbed areas immediately after the completion of construction to reduce wind erosion.

Therefore, with implementation of the listed mitigation measures, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on air quality due to construction related emissions.

#### *Project Operations Related Air Quality*

The proposed project would not significantly increase carbon monoxide concentrations along the project corridor. The proposed project would not create a "new hot" spot nor cause further exceedance of the CO standards. However, the NNCP and associated EIR incorporates project requirements of developing and implementing a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Strategy and Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS) to mitigate air quality impacts from the buildout of the North Natomas Community.

The proposed project will be required to implement a TSM Strategy. The Strategy helps make the maximum use of the existing transportation system, thus reducing the need for or delaying construction of new transportation facilities. The TSM strategies work in several ways: 1) to reduce the number and length of vehicle trips, 2) to spread traffic throughout the day, or 3) to improve traffic flows. TSM measures are also intended to reduce air pollution levels. The TSM plan is a citywide requirement per the City Zoning Ordinance, Division VI., Chapter 17.184. The applicant may select from a menu of options that, used collectively, will reduce peak hour trips by at least 35 percent. The options include bike lockers and showers, carpool/vanpool incentives, transit incentives, and others.

All development in the NNCP area is required to submit a project-wide Air Quality Mitigation Strategy to reduce ROG emissions generated by the community. The NNCP contains an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy, which requires that projects in North Natomas be planned and developed in a way that reduces the community's reliance on single-occupant vehicles. Three types of measures are included in the strategy: 1) site design, 2) target area, and 3) community wide.

The City Planning and Building and Public Works Departments, with help from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), will verify that a 35 percent community-wide reduction in projected ROG emissions will result from successful implementation of the AQMS submitted for the proposed project. All new residential development must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 20 percent compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline. And all non-residential development must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 50 percent compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline (NNCP pg. 48). Promotion of electric, other zero-emission, and low-emissions vehicle use is part of the AQMS. This NNCP requirement is in addition to the citywide requirement that all new residential developments prepare a TSM plan.

Additionally, calculations of the long-term emissions associated with operations of the proposed project have been calculated using SMAQMD's 1994 *Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook* and listed below.

**TABLE 5-3  
LONG-TERM EMISSIONS**

Pollutant	Significance Threshold	Estimated Project Emissions
ROG	65 lbs/day	54 lbs/day
NO <sub>x</sub>	65 lbs/day	50 lbs/day
PM <sub>10</sub>	275 lbs/day	216 lbs/day

As estimated above, impacts from long-term emissions associated with the project site would remain below the SMAQMD threshold; therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated. Additionally, implementation of the requirements of the NNCP and City Code would further ensure that less-than-significant air quality impacts would result from the proposed project.

**Question B**

The pollutant of concern for sensitive receptors is CO. Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County. For purposes of environmental analysis, sensitive receptor locations generally include parks, sidewalks, transit stops, hospitals, rest homes, schools, playgrounds, and residences. Commercial buildings are generally not considered sensitive receptors.

Receptors within the project area are not expected to experience air quality impacts that would exceed any state or federal standards beyond regional levels. In general, the land uses west of the Truxel 3 project area include Employment Center land uses. A Regional Transit Light-Rail Station is planned for Truxel Road, southwest from the project site. Though Light-Rail commuters would be exposed to any air quality impacts due to the project, it is not expected that the impacts would exceed any state or federal standards. As discussed above, short-term construction emissions would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts. Operational air quality impacts associated with CO concentration were calculated using the SMAQMD's 1994 *Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook* and are reflected below.

**TABLE 5-4  
CO EMISSIONS CONCENTRATION**

Pollutant	1 - Hour	8 - Hour
CAAQ CO Threshold	20.00 ppm	9.00 ppm
Estimated Project Concentration	7.73 ppm	5.55 ppm

Therefore, based upon the calculated emission concentration of CO parts per million being below the CAAQ threshold, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact to sensitive receptors.

**Question C**

Construction activities are not expected to result in significant impacts to air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on air movement, moisture, temperature, or cause any change in climate.

**Question D**

Emissions from construction vehicles could create some short-term objectionable odors; however, any construction-related odors would be localized to the immediate vicinity of construction operations and would be temporary. Additionally, Standard Construction Specifications would include compliance with SMAQMD's Rule 405 on dust and condensed fumes.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact associated with objectionable odors anticipated to result from project construction.

**FINDINGS**

Implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

*Roads.* I-80 and I-5 are the two major freeways that serve the project area. I-80 is an east-west, six lane interstate freeway that runs along the southern boundary of the project area. An interchange is located near the project area at Truxel Road. I-5 is a north-south, six-lane, interstate freeway two miles west of the site. Access to I-5 from the project site is via Del Paso Road or I-80. The major streets serving the site are Truxel Road (Natomas Boulevard) and Gateway Park Boulevard. Within the proposed project area, Truxel Road is a north/south six lane arterial and Gateway Park Boulevard is a four lane major collector. Adjacent and nearby intersections include; Truxel Road/Arena Boulevard, Gateway Park Boulevard/Arena Boulevard, Raley's Drive/Gateway Park Boulevard, Truxel Road/Gateway Park Boulevard, Truxel Road/I-80. A bikeway facility currently does not exist on the project area (Supplement to the NNCP EIR, pg. 4.3-2).

All of the key intersections near or within the project area currently have peak hour conditions

in the Level of Service (LOS) A to C range.

### **Bikeways**

An on-street bikeway is planned along Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site. A bike trail is designated over I-80 in the 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan.

### **Regional Transit**

Regional Transit (RT) is the major public transportation service provider within Sacramento County providing 20.6 miles of light rail service and fixed-route bus service on 77 routes covering a 418 square-mile area, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Existing bus routes in the project area are #11, 13, and 14, which have stops along Truxel Road and/or Gateway Park Boulevard. RT currently is in the planning process of developing a Light Rail Line that will serve North Natomas and Sacramento International Airport. Several alignments are being considered along Truxel Road. Bus service is provided on 60-minute intervals from about 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. during weekdays and from about 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. One additional bus is added during the weekday AM peak period, resulting in 30-minute headways during that period.

### **Parking**

There is presently no on-street parking allowed on Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard or existing parking within the project site, as the site is vacant. There is an existing area to the southeast of the intersection of Gateway Park Boulevard and Truxel Road that vehicles have used for pulling off the roadway. However, it is not a developed or approved parking area.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

*Roadway Traffic.* An impact is considered significant for roadways or intersections when the project causes the facility to change from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse. For facilities that are, or would be worse than LOS C without the project, an impact is also considered significant if the project: 1) increases the average delay by five seconds or more at an intersection, or 2) increases the volume to capacity ratio by .02 or more on a roadway.

*Bikeways.* An impact is considered significant if implementation of the project will disrupt or interfere with existing or planned (Bikeways Master Plan) bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

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

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

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

The proposed land uses of the project are designated in the General Plan and North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). In addition to previously prepared environmental documents for the SGPU and NNCP, the potential impact of the proposed land uses for the subject project have been analyzed in traffic impact studies for other projects in the area. Traffic Impact Studies were done for Natomas Market Place and Coral Business Center. The traffic generated from the proposed project will not result in any traffic impacts not already analyzed. In view of this, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a less-than-significant impact on the transportation and circulation system.

#### **Questions B and E**

Public improvements required for the project will be designed to appropriate standards to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento, Department of Public Works. Therefore, the creation of hazards is not expected and no mitigation is required.

#### **Question C**

Existing road infrastructure provides adequate emergency access to the proposed project site. The project proposes a new driveway to provide emergency access. The project site will be designed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento Public Works Department and the Fire Department. Potential emergency access impacts are considered to be less-than-significant.

#### **Question D**

All construction parking would occur on-site and would be short-term in nature. Parking would be required to comply with the City's Zoning Ordinance (Title 17, Chap. 17.64).

Therefore, with compliance of the City's parking requirements, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact to on-site or off-site parking capacity.

#### **Questions F and G**

Regular route schedules may be affected by slower clearance through the intersection due to construction vehicle obstruction. However, any delay would be temporary and of short duration, resulting in less-than-significant impacts to transit operations. Though Bus Routes #11, 13 and 14 travel adjacent to the project site, staging areas would be situated on-site and away from the transit stops preventing any interference with the transit system. At the time of Special Permit application, the project site will be required to comply with the City Zoning Ordinance requirements for bicycle spaces. Additionally, the developer would be required to comply with all applicable regulations for projects that encroach into the City's right-of-way, which would further ensure that impacts would be less-than-significant.

There are no rail, waterborne, or air transportation resources using the adjacent drainageways. Based on the nature of the project and compliance with City regulations, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, rail, waterborne, or air traffic transportation.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

**FINDINGS**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant transportation/circulation impacts.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed project is located within the North Natomas Community Plan area of the City of Sacramento. The site is also located within the Natomas Basin, a low-lying region in the Sacramento Valley, located east of the Sacramento River and north of the American River. The Natomas Basin contains incorporated and unincorporated areas within the jurisdictions of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, and Sutter County. Historically the Basin was primarily in agricultural production. The existing water conveyance systems within the Natomas Basin were created for water conveyance and drainage. They provide nesting, feeding, and migration corridor habitat for a variety of species in the Basin.

The Natomas Basin contains a variety of habitat types, open water aquatic habitat (including ditches and drains), emergent marsh, riparian forest, riparian scrub-shrub, grassland, vernal pools, and agriculture. A number of special-status species (wildlife and plant), as determined by the California Department Fish and Game (CDFG) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), inhabit or forage within the Natomas Basin.

The site was formerly agricultural land and portions of the site have been covered with fill material to a depth of two or three feet covering the native soil profile. The site is currently fallow but has been mowed for weed control. An abandoned irrigation ditch forms the eastern boundary of the site. The ditch, although it appears to be no longer used for irrigation, supports a dense growth of Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*).

In 1990, a biological survey was conducted for the Coral Business Center Planned Unit Development (PUD) adjacent to the project site in North Natomas. In 1990, investigation was made into the presence of trees, special-status plants, special-status animals, and wildlife habitat within the PUD project area. Results from this PUD assessment detailed a narrow strip of fresh emergent wetlands along the eastern border of the project site and an east-west running canal, which traversed the middle of the project site. No special-status plants were found on the project site; however, habitat for California hibiscus did occur. Three special-status birds were observed: northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), black-shouldered kite (*Elanus caeruleus*), and long-billed curlew (*Numenius americanus*). The project site was also noted to have contained appropriate habitat for giant garter snake. On January 11, 2000, due to the lapse of 10 years since the prior analysis, EIP Associates biologists resurveyed the proposed project site for biological resources. Site alterations have occurred since the prior survey, including development of the Raley's and Coca-Cola plants within the PUD to the north, the development of Gateway Park Drive, and the disappearance of the east-west aligned canal, which was located on the project site. The trees that lined the banks of this drainage canal also no longer exist. No wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were located on the project site and the water-related birds that formerly utilized this riparian area were also not observed during the January 2000 study. The 2000 study identified burrowing owls and the potential for giant garter snake.

### Vegetation

The ruderal fields predominate within the project area. The site was formerly agricultural land and portions of the site have been covered with fill material to a depth of two or three feet covering the native soil profile. The site is currently fallow but has been mowed for weed control. The plants in these areas consist of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), mustard (*Brassica campestris*), yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), and ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*). An abandoned irrigation ditch forms the eastern boundary of the site. The ditch, although it appears to be no longer used for irrigation, supports a dense growth of Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*).

No Heritage Trees are located on the project site, and no trees are located within the project site.

## Wildlife

The ruderal and agricultural fields within the project area are of low wildlife value because they are mowed, dominated by non-native plants, and disturbed by human activity. The only wildlife species observed within these fields during the field survey were the rock dove (*Columba livia*), red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), and western mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*).

## Sensitive Species

Appendix C includes a table that lists the special-status species potentially occurring within the project area. This table is based on a review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CDFG, 2001), the California Native Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (CNPS, 2001), the special-status species list provided by the USFWS, the City of Sacramento's Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP; City of Sacramento, 2003), and May & Associates, Inc. unpublished file information on rare plant and wildlife species in Sacramento County (May & Associates, 2002). Additional literature consulted in the preparation of this report is listed in Section VI, References.

No special-status plant species are present or expected to be present within the project area. The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is the only federally or state listed animal species potentially present within the project area. The western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugea*), the white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), and the tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) are the only non-listed special-status animal species potentially present within the project area. The project area does not support special-status critical habitat, including special-status fish habitat. Anadromous fish species are not expected to be found within the project area.

## The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP)

The 1994 North Natomas Community Plan requires the development and implementation of a Habitat Conservation Plan as mitigation for development in North Natomas. In 2003, the NBHCP was approved by the City of Sacramento, USFWS, and CDFG.

The NBHCP is a conservation plan supporting application for incidental take permits (ITP) under Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act and under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code. The purpose of the NBHCP is to promote biological conservation while allowing urban development and continuation of agriculture within the Natomas Basin. The NBHCP establishes a multi-species conservation program to mitigate the expected loss of habitat values and incidental take of protected species that would result from urban development, operation of irrigation and drainage systems, and rice farming. The goal of the NBHCP is to preserve, restore, and enhance habitat values found in the Natomas Basin.

To support the issuance of an ITP, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for the National Environmental Policy Act requirement and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the CEQA requirement. The USFWS is the Lead Federal Agency for the preparation of the EIS and the City of Sacramento and Sutter County are co-Lead Agencies for the preparation of the EIR.

On May 13, 2003, the City of Sacramento approved the NBHCP and EIR/EIS. Then on June 27, 2003, the USFWS issued an ITP on the approved NBHCP and EIR/EIS. The City has an existing CDFG 2081 permit that was amended July 10, 2003 based upon the recently approved NBHCP.

The proposed project is located within an area of North Natomas that would be required to comply with all provisions of the NBHCP.

### **Wetlands and "Waters of the United States"**

An abandoned irrigation ditch forms the eastern boundary of the site. The ditch, although it appears to be no longer used for irrigation, supports a dense growth of Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*). The ditch does not support any wetlands plants, therefore, the ditch is not considered wetland habitat.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

### **Standards of Significance**

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be considered significant if any of the following conditions, or potential therefore, 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 affected area;
- Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, destruction of the habitat, reduction of the population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal;
- Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands); or
- Violate the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance (City Code 12:64.040).

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

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

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

## ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

### Question A

Development of the proposed project would result in disturbance to plant and wildlife habitat within the project area. The CNNDDB and CNPS records identified 14 special-status species from the Taylor Monument and Rio Linda 7.5 minute quadrangles (i.e., three plant species and 11 wildlife species) that could or do occur in the vicinity of the project site. However, there are no known occurrences of special-status species on the project site (CNDDDB 2002, CNPS 2002), and no special-status species were observed on the site during the biological surveys done for the proposed project (see Appendices B, C, and D).

Three special-status plant species including Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*), dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*), and legenere (*Legenere limosa*) are known to occur in seasonal wetland habitats (i.e., vernal pools) in the vicinity of the project site (CNDDDB 2002); however, the Truxel 3 project site lacks seasonal wetland habitats for these species, therefore they are not expected to be present.

Of the 11 wildlife species identified by the CNDDDB records, three have potential to use the project site (i.e., Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugea*), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*)). The only tree on the project site is a small black willow (*Salix gooddingii*). No nests were observed at the time of the field survey on July 10, 2002. Swainson's hawks require large nesting trees with a panoramic view of their foraging grounds.

Foraging habitats, open fields, and grasslands, need to be within flying distance (about 18 miles) and large enough to support the high densities of rodent populations and birds upon which they feed. The area required for foraging depends on vegetation, prey populations supported, and the type of farming that occurs in the foraging habitat. Suitable cover types for foraging habitats include native grassland, agriculture soon after discing, alfalfa and other hay crops, fallow fields, grazed pasture, combinations of hay, grain, and row crops, and rice fields prior to flooding and after draining.

Swainson's hawk nesting in the Natomas Basin occurs almost exclusively along the Sacramento River on the Basin's west side and within about one mile of the Sacramento River. Only two nest sites are known to actually occur inside the NBHCP area. Approximately 22 additional known nests are located adjacent to the NBHCP area on the water side of the Sacramento River levees. The nearest recorded Swainson's hawk nest is on the Taylor Monument USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle along the Sacramento River located three miles west of the project site. Swainson's hawks forage throughout the Natomas Basin.

No burrowing owls were observed during the survey and none are reported from the vicinity.

The CNDDDB (2002) reports a white-tailed kite occurrence on the Rio Linda USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle 6.5 miles northeast of the project site.

The blackberry bramble in the abandoned irrigation ditch is suitable nesting habitat for tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*); however, no tricolored blackbirds were observed during the late survey.

The CNDDDB search also listed occurrences of valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*), northwestern pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), great egret (*Ardea alba*), black-crowned night heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), and Sacramento splittail (*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus*) in the general vicinity. Due to lack of suitable habitat (i.e., lack of elderberries, open water, and emergent marsh), there is a low chance for occurrence of these species.

Open water does not traverse the project site, and therefore migratory fish species would not be impacted. No reported migratory wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors were identified within the project area, therefore migratory wildlife would not be impacted.

The giant garter snake is one of the largest snakes of the genus *Thamnophis*, with a total length up to 4.5 feet or greater. Habitat components most important to giant garter snake survival are water, emergent aquatic vegetation and steep, vegetated banks for cover, and an abundant food supply. The giant garter snake occurs in a combination of permanent and seasonal freshwater habitats and conducts most of its activities within the immediate vicinity of the water.

Giant garter snakes usually occur within a few feet of water and are often found between the water level and the top of adjacent banks or embankments. Due to the lack of open water and emergent marsh, there is a low chance for occurrence of the giant garter snake.

The Northwestern pond turtle is associated with permanent or nearly-permanent water in a wide variety of habitats. Habitat requirements include slack or slow-moving water, upland sites for nesting, and basking sites such as partially submerged logs, rocks, mats of floating vegetation, or open mud banks. Due to the absence of open water and mud banks, there is a low chance for occurrence of the Northwestern pond turtle.

The following mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures BR-1 through BR-3) would be implemented by the City in order to comply with the requirements of the NBHCP and to mitigate potential impacts to the Swainson's hawk, western burrowing owl, white-tailed kite, and tricolored blackbird.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

BR-1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall either: (i) provide ½ acre of mitigation land that meets the requirements of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for each acre of land authorized for disturbance; or (ii) pay the required NBHCP fees. No permit can be issued unless one of these has occurred. If the applicant acquires land and transfers it to the Conservancy, the applicant must pay that portion of the NBHCP fees other than the acquisition portion. Applicant land acquisitions must be approved in advance by the Conservancy.

BR-2. A pre-construction survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist in order to determine the presence and status of special-status species and their habitats within

the project area, including Swainson's hawk, western burrowing owl, white-tailed kite, and tricolored blackbird. The results of the pre-construction surveys along with recommended take minimization measures shall be documented in a report and submitted to the USFWS and the CDFG. If necessary, the City shall implement specific take minimization measures as directed by the CDFG and the USFWS.

BR-3. The project applicant/developer shall: (1) comply with all requirements of the NBHCP, together with any additional requirements specified in the North Natomas Community Plan EIR; (2) comply with any additional mitigation measures identified in the NBHCP EIR/EIS; and (3) comply with all conditions in the incidental take permits issued by the USFWS and CDFG.

Therefore, with implementation of the listed mitigation measures, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on special-status species or their habitats.

#### **Question B**

The proposed project would not substantially impact any locally designated species as the project site is primarily ruderal in nature. The one tree located on the proposed project site is a small black willow that does not meet the requirements of a heritage tree. The project site lacks year-round water sources and trees, therefore no impacts to locally designated species are expected.

May & Associates, Inc's biologist and botanist conducted a field survey of the project site on July 10, 2002. The field survey confirmed the lack of trees within the project site. Due to the lack of trees within the project site, no trees would require removal, and therefore, no impacts to tree preservation policies or ordinances are expected.

#### **Question C**

The proposed project would not impact wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool) as the project site lacks seasonal wetlands and a year-round water source. An abandoned irrigation ditch forms the eastern boundary of the site. The ditch, although it appears to be no longer used for irrigation, supports a dense growth of Himalayan blackberry. Based on two separate surveys of the site, the ditch is not believed to be jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (Foothill Associates 2002, May & Associates, Inc. 2002). Within the study area, the proposed project lacks wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool); therefore, impacts to wetlands and/or "waters of the U.S." are not anticipated. Based on the conclusions of the two separate biological surveys and the absence of wetland vegetation along and within the abandoned ditch located along the eastern property, the proposed project is expected to have a less-than-significant impact on wetland habitat.

#### **Mitigation Measure**

No mitigation is required.

#### **FINDINGS**

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to biological

resources to a less-than-significant level.

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

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### Gas Service

Gas service is supplied to the City of Sacramento and the project area by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). PG&E gas lines are located adjacent to the Truxel roadway corridor.

### Electrical Services

Electricity is supplied to the City of Sacramento and the project area by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). SMUD electrical lines are located adjacent to the Truxel roadway corridor.

### City of Sacramento

The City of Sacramento is a member of the Underground Service Alert (U.S.A.) one-call program. Under this program, the Contractor is required to notify the U.S.A. 48 hours in advance of performing excavation work. The developer has the responsibility for timely removal, relocation, or protection of any existing utility services located on the site of any construction project.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

### **Gas Service**

A significant environmental impact would result if the project would require Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) to secure a new gas source beyond their current supplies.

### **Electrical Services**

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

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Questions A, B and C**

Development construction at the intersection of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard may require additional gas connections. The proposed project is consistent with the planned uses of the SGPU and NNCP and no new significant supplies will be needed. Limited additional electrical supplies would be necessary for the proposed street lights and parking lights along Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard. The proposed project may require the relocation of gas and electrical lines. Relocation of private utilities would be the responsibility of the utility companies themselves. Detailed project plans would be forwarded to affected utility companies for use in planning the relocation of their facilities, if necessary.

The project would require the consumption of fossil fuels during construction. Construction equipment would be maintained and tuned at the interval recommended by the manufacturers to ensure efficient use of fuel (see Mitigation Measures under Air Quality for additional information).

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on power and natural gas, non-renewable resources, the demand of existing sources of energy, or the development of new sources of energy.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

## **FINDINGS**

The proposed project would not result in impacts to energy and utilities.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>9. HAZARDS</b>			
<i>Would the proposal involve:</i>			
A) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?			X
B) Possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?			X
C) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?			X
D) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?			X
E) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?			X

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Hazardous waste is defined as any waste material that is a potential threat to human health and environment, having the capacity to cause serious illness or death.

No sources of substantial risk to human health, including toxic or hazardous substances are known to be present within the project area. Substantial toxic spills are not known to have taken place within the area. The area is readily accessible to emergency vehicles in the event of an emergency. The NNCP EIR identifies mosquitoes within undeveloped areas, in particular, rice fields, as a potential human health threat. Mitigation for mosquito abatement was adopted in order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Regulatory Requirements**

- Borings, wells, or any sampling activities that involve drilling and that come within 10 feet of groundwater must have a permit from the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, Hazardous Materials Division (HMD).
- Hazardous materials that shall be used during the project and which exceed the reportable quantity must be reported to the HMD. A Hazardous Materials Plan (HMP) must be filed with HMD. The reportable quantity of hazardous materials is:

- 55 gallons or more of a hazardous material in liquid state
- 200 cubic feet or more of a compressed gas
- 500 pounds or more of a hazardous material in a solid state

Similarly, any hazardous waste generated as part of this project would require a hazardous waste generator permit from HMD. A permit can be obtained by completing a HMP with HMD.

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

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

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

Operation of the proposed project would not generate additional risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances associated with vehicle operations. It is not anticipated that hazardous or toxic substances would be stored on the site.

Should toxic or flammable materials be used or stored on the site, a disclosure statement must be filed with the Fire Department, which includes a list of those materials, the maximum amounts anticipated, how and where these materials are stored, and uses. The Fire Department prepares an emergency plan, which contains this information. Additionally, the applicant/developer would be required to comply with all regulatory requirements established by local, state, and federal law. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact from accidental explosions or releases of hazardous materials.

### **Question B**

Construction of the proposed project is not expected to interfere with emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. In order to ensure that emergency response or emergency evacuation plans are not affected by the proposed project, a traffic management plan, including stage construction plans, a construction schedule, and a description of the City's noticing procedures, would be prepared by the applicant/developer prior to commencement of construction activities. Traffic diversion may be necessary for the construction of the proposed project during improvements along Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard. In general, the

construction Contractor would use lane reductions rather than closures or detours. Construction would be scheduled to limit interruptions. Public safety and emergency services would be kept informed of construction activities for use in planning emergency response routing. Any work within the City right-of-way would be required to comply with Titles 12 and 15 of the City Code. Compliance with these codes would prevent the interference with an emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on emergency evacuation plans.

#### **Question C**

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in the creation of health hazards. Development of the site would be required to comply with all applicable building codes and requirements. Additionally design of access points connecting with City right-of-way would be completed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento Public Works Department and the Fire Department.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact and would not create any health hazard or potential health hazard.

#### **Question D**

Toxic substances or contaminated soils are not known to be present on the project site, therefore, exposure of people to existing sources of such substances is not expected to result from the proposed project. Potential impacts associated with asbestos would not occur, as no existing structures are present at the site.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact relating to the exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards.

#### **Question E**

The proposed project would not increase fire hazards. Proposed construction activities would involve some vegetation clearing. This cleared vegetation may be flammable if not removed immediately. Compliance with the City's Fire Code (Title 15, Chapter 15.36) provides measures that would reduce the potential for fire hazards to a less-than-significant level.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No Mitigation is required.

#### **FINDINGS**

Through compliance of applicable regulatory requirements, impacts from hazardous materials and fire hazards would be less-than-significant.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<p><b>10. NOISE</b></p> <p><i>Would the proposal result in:</i></p> <p>A) Increases in existing noise levels?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Short-term</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Long-Term</p>			<p>X</p> <p>X</p>
<p>B) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Short-term</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Long-Term</p>			<p>X</p> <p>X</p>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sound levels are usually measured and expressed in decibels (dB) with zero dB being the threshold of hearing. Decibel levels range from zero to 140. Typical examples of decibel levels would be a low decibel level of 50 dB for light traffic to a high decibel level of 120 dB for a jet takeoff at 200 feet.

The major freeways surrounding the project area include I-80 and I-5 (SGPU DEIR, AA-33). At locations where there are no sound walls along Interstate 80 like the Truxel Road off-ramp, noise levels at 150 feet reach approximately 76 dB (SGPU DEIR, AA-33).

The project area is not impacted by noise impacts associated with the Sacramento Metro Airport, as no portions of the project area are within the airport's 60 CNEL contours (NNCP, Page 4.6-17). The project area is not affected by noise from railroad operations. Noise sources such as light industry and commercial traffic contribute to overall noise levels in the project area.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

- Exterior noise levels at the proposed project above the upper value of the normally

acceptable category for various land uses (SGPU DEIR AA-27) caused by noise level increases due to the project;

- Residential interior noise levels of 45  $L_{dn}$  or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- Construction noise levels not in compliance with the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- Exposure of residential and commercial areas to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- Exposure of residential and commercial areas to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; and
- Exposure of Historic buildings and archaeological sites to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Questions A and B**

#### *Construction Noise Impacts*

Temporary increases in noise levels would occur during construction activities. Generally, noise levels at construction sites can vary from 65 dB to a maximum of nearly 90 dB when heavy equipment is used nearby. Construction noise would be intermittent, and noise levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. The most important project-generated noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment. This noise increase would be of short duration and limited primarily to daytime hours. Construction noise is exempt from the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance, provided that construction is limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays. Construction noise could be audible to residential developments to the west and south of the project area. However, the closest residential uses are to the west approximately 0.25 miles away and buffered by Natomas Marketplace Shopping center. The closest residential uses to the south are located approximately 0.38 miles away and are on the opposite side of Interstate 80 (I-80). Based on the location of the project and the relation to the nearest residential uses, development of the proposed project is not anticipated to create any short-term noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

#### *Operational Noise Impacts*

Long-term, post-construction impacts are expected to increase in the project area, as the proposed project would provide highway commercial uses for both the North Natomas Community and travelers of I-80.

While anticipated noise levels at the buildout of the SGPU within the vicinity of the project could be as high as 79 dB  $L_{dn}$ . A 65 dB contour has been identified at approximately 151 feet from the

centerline of Truxel Road within the project vicinity (NNCP EIR, 4.6-28). It is anticipated that future development of the project site would be beyond this contour, due to required setbacks and easements. Additionally, with future building orientation and location on the project site, noise levels would be further reduced to the main entry areas. As a result, noise impacts on the proposed project are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

#### **FINDINGS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Fire Protection**

The City of Sacramento provides fire protection services within the project area. The Fire Department operates approximately 21 stations. Fire stations are located so as to provide a maximum effective service radius of two miles (SGPU DEIR, M-1). This service radius virtually assures blanket coverage of the City. Typical response time to fire calls is four minutes (SGPU DEIR, M-1).

The closest fire station to the project area is Station #15, at 1591 Newborough Drive. The station is located 1.7 miles from the intersection of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard.

**Police Protection**

The project area is served by the City of Sacramento Police Department.

**Schools**

Natomas Unified School District serves the North Natomas area. Schools within the vicinity of the project area include: Natomas Crossing Elementary School, located northwest of the project in the Natomas Crossing Planned Unit Development and Natomas and Discovery High Schools, both located approximately 0.6 miles south of the project across I-80.

### **Other Public Services**

The City of Sacramento provides for other public services within the project area. The City of Sacramento is a member of the Underground Service Alert (U.S.A.) one-call program. Under this program, the Contractor is required to notify the U.S.A. 48 hours in advance of performing excavation work. The developer has the responsibility for timely removal, relocation, or protection of any existing utility services located on the site of any construction project.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

### **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

#### **Questions A – E**

The Truxel 3 Project is not intended to generate new growth; rather, the project would provide additional service/commercial options to commuters and residents of the area, consistent with the NNCP. The proposed project would not require any additional police protection, fire protection, or emergency response services.

The proposed project would not result in effects to existing schools or the need for any new school facilities as no residential development is proposed. No additional public facilities maintenance provisions would be required as a result of the proposed project.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on fire protection, police protection, schools, maintenance of public facilities, and other governmental services.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

### **FINDINGS**

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

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>12. UTILITIES</b> <i>Would the proposal result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</i>			
A) Communication systems?			X
B) Local or regional water supplies?			X
C) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?			X
D) Sewer or septic tanks?			X
E) Storm water drainage?			X
F) Solid waste disposal?			X

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Water Supply/Treatment**

The City of Sacramento currently provides water service from a combination of surface and groundwater sources (SGPU DEIR, H-1). The area south of the American River is served by surface water from the American and Sacramento Rivers. The City also pumps groundwater to areas north of the American River. The City operates three diversion and treatment facilities: the Sacramento River, the American River, and the Riverside water treatments plants; and four storage tanks, each with a three million gallon capacity (SGPU DEIR, H-1). Additionally, the Department of Utilities has determined that the Natomas area requires approximately 12 million gallons of water storage for fire protection, emergency reserve, and supply peak demands. Three new tank sites were identified in the draft North Natomas Water Storage Technical Memorandum. Each site includes a three million gallon water storage tank and 14 million gallon per day booster pump station.

Over the last 14 years, the City has constructed or is currently constructing four new three million gallon storage tanks (Capitol Gateway, Robla Reservoir, El Centro, and San Juan). These water storage tanks will be used for water storage, emergency reserve, and supply peak demands for the planned development within North Natomas.

**Sewer System**

The City of Sacramento, including the project area, is serviced by the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) (SGPU DEIR, I-1). The SRCSD is responsible for the

operation of all regional interceptors and wastewater treatment plants. The Regional Plant has an existing capacity of approximately 150 million gallons per day (mgd) of dry weather flow and 300 mgd of wet weather flow (SGPU DEIR, I-1). The plant discharges effluent subjected to secondary treatment into the Sacramento River downstream from City of Sacramento domestic water supplies.

### **Storm Water Drainage**

The storm water drainage system of the City is a complex network of natural channels, canals, levees, subsurface drains, and pumping systems. All drainage from the area near the proposed project site is ultimately directed to the Sacramento River. Reclamation District 1000 (RD1000) has jurisdiction of the drainage canal system in the vicinity of the project. RD1000 canals located near the project include: The East Drainage Canal flows from the north to the south, approximately 980 feet west of the project area; the C-1 Canal, located approximately 3,750 feet (0.7 mile) to the north; and the B Drain, located approximately 440 feet to the south. Both the C-1 Canal and the B Drain connect to the East Drainage Canal. There is an existing 60-inch storm drain line located in Gateway Park Boulevard that connects to Sump 20, southwest of the project site.

### **Solid Waste**

The City of Sacramento Solid Waste Division collects most solid waste generated in the City and disposes of it in the Kiefer Landfill. The project is required to meet the City's Recycling and Solid Waste Disposal Regulations (Chap. 17.72 of the Zoning Ordinance). The purpose of the ordinance is to regulate the location, size, and design of features of recycling and trash enclosures in order to meet provide adequate, convenient space for the collection, storage, and loading of recyclable and solid waste material for existing and new development; to increase recycling of used materials; and to reduce litter.

### **Potential Impacts to Utilities**

Impacts to utilities have been previously addressed in the 1987 Sacramento General Plan Update. The mitigation measures are provided in "Section H" of the Planning Document, and the impacts have been reduced to a less-than-significant level.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

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

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

The proposed project would require connection to communications systems consistent with the SGPU and NNCP, which anticipated such development in North Natomas. These connections are standard and would not result in a detriment to microwave, radar, or radio transmissions. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on communications systems.

### **Question B**

The proposed project would not impact local or regional water supplies. The project design and proposed BMPs would treat stormwater runoff prior to entering local or regional water supplies. Potential contamination of water supplies as a result of gas leaks and spills from vehicles would be slightly increased due to additional vehicle use in the area as a result of the proposed project. However, this would not be considered significant because of the BMPs and stormwater treatment proposed as part of the project.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on local or regional water supplies.

### **Question C**

The irrigation for the landscaping as well as the water supplies to the facilities would connect to the City's water supply consistent with the SGPU and NNCP, which anticipated such development in North Natomas. All connections would be designed to applicable standards to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities. As a result, the project would not result in significant impacts to existing local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities.

### **Question D**

The proposed project would result in the need for connection to sewer facilities. No septic or sewer are currently located on the project site. Sewer facilities in the area, are provided by Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1). All connections to the public sewer system shall be to the satisfaction of CSD-1.

Existing SRCSD facilities serving this proposed project are capacity constrained. Ultimate capacity will be provided by construction of the Lower Northwest and Upper Northwest Interceptors, currently scheduled for completion in 2010. SRCSD is working to identify potential interim projects to provide additional capacity. SRCSD and CSD-1 will issue sewer permits to connect to the system if it is determined that capacity is available and the property has met all other requirements for service. This process is "first come, first served". There is no guarantee

that capacity will be available when actual requests for sewer service are made. Once connected, the property has entitlement to use the system. However, its entitlement is limited to the capacity accounted for by the payment of the appropriate fees. Developing the properties may require the payment of additional sewer impact fees. Based on the mandatory compliance of CSD-1 requirements for sewer connections, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on sewer systems.

**Question E**

The proposed project would not result in impacts to stormwater drainage patterns, as project design and proposed BMPs would treat stormwater runoff.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on stormwater drainage patterns.

**Question F**

The proposed project would require solid waste disposal services or facilities. Solid waste generated during construction as well as from the completed structures themselves would require solid waste disposal as a result of the proposed project. Waste associated with construction activities could be disposed of by the City of Sacramento Solid Waste Division. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with Chapter 17.72 of the City's Zoning Ordinance regarding solid waste.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on solid waste disposal services or facilities, or the need for any new solid waste disposal facilities.

**FINDINGS**

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

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The visual and aesthetic environment surrounding the proposed project corridor is characterized by typical views of freeways and streets, open space, and commercial land uses. There are no unique or visually outstanding manmade features within the project area.

No lighting is present in the project area.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Aesthetic impacts would be considered significant if the following were to occur:

- Visual impacts would include obstruction of a significant view or viewshed or the introduction of a façade which lacks visual interest and compatibility which would be visible from a public gathering or viewing area;
- *Shadows.* New shadows from developments are generally considered to be significant if they would shade a recognized public gathering place (e.g. park) or place residences/child care centers in complete shade;
- *Glare.* Glare is considered to be significant if it would be cast in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time; or
- *Light.* Light is considered significant if it would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Question A**

The proposed project would not affect a scenic vista or adopted view corridor, as no areas within the roadway corridor are designated as such.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas or adopted view corridors.

### **Question B**

The proposed project would not create a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect, as positive aesthetic components would be included with future project design.

Future design and architecture would be complimentary to existing buildings and structures of the North Natomas area. Future development of the site would be required to comply with PUD Development Guidelines that will be adopted for the site. These development guidelines would address landscaping, architecture design, lighting, parking and circulation, and signage. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on aesthetics.

### **Questions C and D**

The proposed project would create additional light, as facility lighting is proposed within the project site. However, lights would be designed according to City specifications and PUD Development Guidelines to limit the escape of light above the horizontal to avoid potential skyglow or glare impacts.

All lighting design, whether as a part of an individual building permit application or as a collective development project, must comply with the special permit process through the City of Sacramento Planning Commission, as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The intention of the lighting design for the Truxel 3 project is to create an inviting yet secure nighttime environment while avoiding adverse impacts on surrounding future development. The proposed lighting would not conflict with landscaping but would coordinate with building architecture and provide continuous lighting for all pedestrian paths of travel.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact associated with light, glare, or the creation of shadows on adjacent property.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

## **FINDINGS**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to aesthetics, light and glare.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>14. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
A) Disturb paleontological resources?		X	
B) Disturb archaeological resources?		X	
C) Affect historical resources?			X
D) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?			X
E) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?			X

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project area is located within a cultural resources Primary Impact Area as defined by the SGPU, and North Natomas is rated as having a medium to high archaeological sensitivity (SGPU EIR, pg.s V-5 and V-6).

The project area is located within the boundaries of the RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District (HAER-CA-187). The RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District is significant at the state level for the period from 1911 to 1939. The establishment of the RD 1000 as part of a regional reclamation plan resulted in the social, economic, and physical transformation of the region, from the original floodplain to a distinctly different open rural landscape consisting of levees, canals, and roads intersecting to form large blocks of fields. RD 1000 was among the first and largest of the major reclamation districts in the state. The grid pattern created by the canals, roads, and fields, covering 87 square miles, is a contributing characteristic of the District. The RD 1000 was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 1994.

The NNCP designates the majority of the North Natomas area for development. In order to provide flood control and drainage improvements, the City developed the North Natomas Comprehensive Drainage Plan, Levee Improvements, Canal Widening and Additional Pumping Capacity project, which included modifications to many elements of RD 1000. The EIR prepared for this plan identified a significant and unavoidable impact to the RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District. On May 20, 1997, the City Council approved a Statement of Findings of Fact and Overriding Considerations concerning this impact.

As mitigation for impacts to the RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District, the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Reclamation District 1000, HAER No. CA-187 was prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc., at the request of the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. This study also satisfied the requirements of the Historic Properties Treatment Plan for Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape (prepared by Dames & Moore for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)). The HAER thoroughly describes and documents the features and location of the RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District through a historic narrative and photographs. The City of Sacramento acknowledged that future development of land within the RD 1000 would significantly alter historic structures and broad landscape patterns of the RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District.

No additional archaeological or historic resources are known to be present within the project area.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

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

CEQA Guidelines define a significant historical resource as a resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Any resource that has been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be considered eligible for the CRHR. Any resource included in a local register of historical resources, or that has been identified in a historical resources survey that meets the requirements of Public Resources Code 5024.1(g) is considered a historical resource.

A project has an adverse effect on a historic property when the undertaking could alter the characteristics of the property that may qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR, including alteration of location, setting, or use. If impacts to archeological resources would occur, then the lead agency must determine if the site is a historical resource as defined in 15064.5a. If the archeological site is determined to be a historical resource, then the archaeological site shall be treated under the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and Section 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

## **ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

### **Questions A – E**

According to the Sacramento General Plan Update, the project site is located in a Primary Impact Area for cultural, historical, or paleontological resources. Since the Truxel roadway corridor has been previously disturbed by construction and agricultural activities, as identified under “Environmental Setting” above, the likelihood of impacting these resources as part of the proposed project is considered to be low.

No cultural resources have been identified within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE); however, the possibility remains that important cultural resources could be uncovered and impacted during project construction.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES FOR QUESTIONS A THROUGH C**

- CR-1. If subsurface archaeological, historical, or paleontological remains are discovered during construction, work in the area of the find shall stop immediately. A qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.
- CR-2. If human burials are encountered, all work in the area of the find shall stop immediately and the Sacramento County Coroner’s office shall be notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendants would be notified and recommendations for treatment solicited (CEQA Section 15064.5; Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and 5097.98).

Therefore, with implementation of the listed mitigation measures, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on paleontological resources, archaeological resources, historical resources, unique ethnic cultural values, and existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

### **FINDINGS**

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>15. RECREATION</b>			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
A) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?			X
B) Affect existing recreational opportunities?			X

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed project is adjacent to Gateway Park Boulevard and Truxel Road; however, no parks or recreational facilities are currently located on or near the site with the exception of ARCO Arena, which is located approximately one mile to the northwest. The site has been identified for urbanized uses.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

**ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

**Questions A and B**

The proposed project would not increase the demand for recreational facilities, as the proposed project is providing services for commuters and residents. Residential development is not proposed. The proposed project would not adversely affect any existing recreational opportunities, as the lot is currently unoccupied.

Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on recreational facilities or recreational opportunities.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation is required.

**FINDINGS**

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

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
<b>16. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u></b>			
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?		X	
B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?			X
C. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X
D. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Disturb paleontological resources?		X	

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE DISCUSSION**

- A. As discussed in the preceding section, the proposed project could result in impacts to geology, air quality, biological resources, and cultural resources. However, mitigation would be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.
- B. As discussed in the preceding section, the project does not have the potential to achieve

short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- C. When impacts are considered along with, or in combination with other impacts, the project-related impacts are less-than-significant. The proposed project would not add substantially to cumulative effects.
- D. The proposed project would not result in environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. If uncovered during construction, paleontological resources could be impacted. However, mitigation would be implemented to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**SECTION IV. – ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing          | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems  | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics, Light and Glare                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified                 |  |


**SECTION V. – DETERMINATION**

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

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

- I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

7-21-03  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Scott Johnson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

## SECTION VI. - REFERENCES

- AKT Development. 2002. Truxel 3 Development Guidelines. December 18, 2002.
- California Air Resources Control Board (CARB). 1998. Emission Inventory.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Natural Diversity Database. California Department of Fish and Game Natural Heritage Division.
- California Native Plant Society. 2002. California Native Plant Society Database. California Department of Fish and Game Natural Heritage Division.
- City of Sacramento. 1987. Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (SGPU DEIR).
- City of Sacramento. 1986. North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) and EIR Adopted by City Council.
- City of Sacramento. 1994. Supplement to the 1986 North Natomas Community Plan Environmental Impact Report. March 1994.
- City of Sacramento. 1999. North Natomas Community Plan Land Use Map. July 1999.
- City of Sacramento. 1997. Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Sacramento, CA.
- Hickman, James C., ed. 1993. The Jepson Manual, Higher Plants of California.
- May & Associates, Inc. 2002. Unpublished file information on rare plant and wildlife species in Sacramento County.
- May & Associates, Inc. 2002. Biological resources occurring within the Truxel 3 Project area. August 7, 2002.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 1993. The 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan prepared for County of Sacramento Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. September 1993.
- Munz, Philip A. 1973. A California Flora and Supplement.
- Raney Planning and Management, Inc. 2001. Natomas Village Center Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the City of Sacramento. June 1, 2001.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 1994.

**SECTION VII. - PREPARERS**

**HUGHES ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS**

Elizabeth Hughes, President, Quality Control

Catherine LeBlanc, Biologist, IS/MND Writer

Jennifer Nachmanoff, Cultural Resources

Amanda Rose, Environmental Staff, IS/MND Writer

**Exhibit**  
**Schematic Plan**

---

## APPENDIX A

---

### U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Endangered And Threatened Species List







# United States Department of the Interior

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W2605  
Sacramento, California 95825

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1-1-03-SP-1586

March 27, 2003

Ms. Amanda Rose  
Hughes Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
1909 Capitol Avenue, Suite 304  
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Species List for Truxel 3 Project

Dear Ms. Rose:

We are sending the enclosed list in response to your request for information about endangered and threatened species (Enclosure A). The list covers the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute quad(s) where your project is planned.

Please read Important Information About Your Species List (Enclosure B). It explains how we made the list and describes your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act. Contact Justin Ly at (916) 414-6645, if you have any questions about the attached list or your responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act.

For the fastest response to species list requests, address them to the attention of Species Lists at this address. You may fax requests to (916) 414-6712 or 414-6713.

Sincerely,

  
fm Chris Nagano, Chief  
Endangered Species Division

Enclosures

ENCLOSURE A  
Endangered and Threatened Species that May Occur in  
or be Affected by Projects in the Selected Quads Listed Below  
Reference File No. 1-1-03-SP-1586

**Truxel 3 Project**

March 27, 2003

QUAD: 512B RIO LINDA

**Listed Species**

Birds

bald eagle, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (T)

Reptiles

giant garter snake, *Thamnophis gigas* (T)

Amphibians

California tiger salamander, *Ambystoma californiense* (C/E)

California red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii* (T)

Fish

delta smelt, *Hypomesus transpacificus* (T)

Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS

winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS

Sacramento splittail, *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (T)

Invertebrates

vernal pool fairy shrimp, *Branchinecta lynchi* (T)

valley elderberry longhorn beetle, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (T)

vernal pool tadpole shrimp, *Lepidurus packardii* (E)

**Proposed Species**

Birds

mountain plover, *Charadrius montanus* (PT)

Invertebrates

Critical habitat, vernal pool invertebrates, See *Federal Register* 67:59883 (PX)

Plants

Critical habitat, vernal pool plants, See *Federal Register* 67:59883 (PX)

**Candidate Species**

Fish

green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris* (C)

Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (C) NMFS

**Species of Concern****Mammals**

- Pacific western big-eared bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii townsendii* (SC)
- small-footed myotis bat, *Myotis ciliolabrum* (SC)
- long-legged myotis bat, *Myotis volans* (SC)
- Yuma myotis bat, *Myotis yumanensis* (SC)
- San Joaquin pocket mouse, *Perognathus inornatus* (SC)

**Birds**

- tricolored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor* (SC)
- western burrowing owl, *Athene cunicularia hypugaea* (SC)
- oak titmouse, *Baeolophus inornatus* (SLC)
- Aleutian Canada goose, *Branta canadensis leucopareia* (D)
- Swainson's hawk, *Buteo Swainsoni* (CA)
- ferruginous hawk, *Buteo regalis* (SC)
- Lawrence's goldfinch, *Carduelis lawrencei* (SC)
- Vaux's swift, *Chaetura vauxi* (SC)
- white-tailed (=black shouldered) kite, *Elanus leucurus* (SC)
- little willow flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii brewsteri* (CA)
- prairie falcon, *Falco mexicanus* (SC)
- American peregrine falcon, *Falco peregrinus anatum* (D)
- greater sandhill crane, *Grus canadensis tabida* (CA)
- loggerhead shrike, *Lanius ludovicianus* (SC)
- Lewis' woodpecker, *Melanerpes lewis* (SC)
- long-billed curlew, *Numenius americanus* (SC)
- Nuttall's woodpecker, *Picoides nuttallii* (SLC)
- white-faced ibis, *Plegadis chihi* (SC)
- bank swallow, *Riparia riparia* (CA)
- rufous hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus* (SC)

**Reptiles**

- northwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata marmorata* (SC)
- California horned lizard, *Phrynosoma coronatum frontale* (SC)

**Amphibians**

- western spadefoot toad, *Spea hammondi* (SC)

**Fish**

- river lamprey, *Lampetra ayresi* (SC)
- Pacific lamprey, *Lampetra tridentata* (SC)

longfin smelt, *Spirinchus thaleichthys* (SC)

Invertebrates

Midvalley fairy shrimp, *Branchinecta mesovallensis* (SC)

California linderiella fairy shrimp, *Linderiella occidentalis* (SC)

Plants

Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop, *Gratiola heterosepala* (CA) \*

legenere, *Legenere limosa* (SC)

QUAD: 513A TAYLOR MONUMENT

**Listed Species**

Birds

bald eagle, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (T)

Reptiles

giant garter snake, *Thamnophis gigas* (T)

Amphibians

California tiger salamander, *Ambystoma californiense* (C/E)

California red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii* (T)

Fish

delta smelt, *Hypomesus transpacificus* (T)

Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS

Critical habitat, winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS

Sacramento splittail, *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (T)

Invertebrates

vernal pool fairy shrimp, *Branchinecta lynchi* (T)

valley elderberry longhorn beetle, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (T)

vernal pool tadpole shrimp, *Lepidurus packardii* (E)

**Proposed Species**

Birds

mountain plover, *Charadrius montanus* (PT)

**Candidate Species**

Birds

Western yellow-billed cuckoo, *Coccyzus americanus occidentalis* (C)

Fish

green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris* (C)

Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (C) NMFS  
 Critical habitat, Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (C) NMFS

### **Species of Concern**

#### **Mammals**

Pacific western big-eared bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii townsendii* (SC)  
 small-footed myotis bat, *Myotis ciliolabrum* (SC)  
 long-legged myotis bat, *Myotis volans* (SC)  
 Yuma myotis bat, *Myotis yumanensis* (SC)  
 San Joaquin pocket mouse, *Perognathus inornatus* (SC)

#### **Birds**

tricolored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor* (SC)  
 western burrowing owl, *Athene cunicularia hypugaea* (SC)  
 oak titmouse, *Baeolophus inornatus* (SLC)  
 Aleutian Canada goose, *Branta canadensis leucopareia* (D)  
 Swainson's hawk, *Buteo Swainsoni* (CA)  
 ferruginous hawk, *Buteo regalis* (SC)  
 Lawrence's goldfinch, *Carduelis lawrencei* (SC)  
 Vaux's swift, *Chaetura vauxi* (SC)  
 white-tailed (=black shouldered) kite, *Elanus leucurus* (SC)  
 little willow flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii brewsteri* (CA)  
 prairie falcon, *Falco mexicanus* (SC)  
 American peregrine falcon, *Falco peregrinus anatum* (D)  
 greater sandhill crane, *Grus canadensis tabida* (CA)  
 loggerhead shrike, *Lanius ludovicianus* (SC)  
 Lewis' woodpecker, *Melanerpes lewis* (SC)  
 long-billed curlew, *Numenius americanus* (SC)  
 Nuttall's woodpecker, *Picoides nuttallii* (SLC)  
 white-faced ibis, *Plegadis chihi* (SC)  
 bank swallow, *Riparia riparia* (CA)  
 rufous hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus* (SC)

#### **Reptiles**

northwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata marmorata* (SC)

#### **Amphibians**

western spadefoot toad, *Spea hammondi* (SC)

#### **Fish**

river lamprey, *Lampetra ayresi* (SC)

Pacific lamprey, *Lampetra tridentata* (SC)  
 longfin smelt, *Spirinchus thaleichthys* (SC)

## Invertebrates

Antioch Dunes anthicid beetle, *Anthicus antiochensis* (SC)  
 Sacramento anthicid beetle, *Anthicus sacramento* (SC)  
 Midvalley fairy shrimp, *Branchinecta mesovallensis* (SC)  
 California linderiella fairy shrimp, *Linderiella occidentalis* (SC)

## KEY:

(E)	<i>Endangered</i>	Listed (in the Federal Register) as being in danger of extinction.
(T)	<i>Threatened</i>	Listed as likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.
(P)	<i>Proposed</i>	Officially proposed (in the Federal Register) for listing as endangered or threatened.
(PX)	<i>Proposed Critical Habitat</i>	Proposed as an area essential to the conservation of the species.
(C)	<i>Candidate</i>	Candidate to become a <i>proposed</i> species.
(SC)	<i>Species of Concern</i>	May be endangered or threatened. Not enough biological information has been gathered to support listing at this time.
(SLC)	<i>Species of Local Concern</i>	Species of local or regional concern or conservation significance.
(MB)	<i>Migratory Bird</i>	Migratory bird
NMFS	NMFS species	Under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service. Contact them directly.
(D)	<i>Delisted</i>	Delisted. Status to be monitored for 5 years.
(CA)	<i>State-Listed</i>	Listed as threatened or endangered by the State of California.
(*)	<i>Extirpated</i>	Possibly extirpated from this quad.
(**)	<i>Extinct</i>	Possibly extinct.
	<i>Critical Habitat</i>	Area essential to the conservation of a species.

**ENCLOSURE B**  
**Important Information**  
**About Your Species List**

**How We Make Species Lists**

We store information about endangered and threatened species lists by U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute *quads*. The United States is divided into these quads, which are about the size of San Francisco. If you requested your list by quad name or number, that is what we used. Otherwise, we used the information you sent us to determine which quad or quads to use.

The animals on your species list are ones that occur within, *or may be affected by projects within*, the quads covered by the list. Fish and other aquatic species appear on your list if they are in the same watershed as your quad or if water use in your quad might affect them. Amphibians will be on the list for a quad or county if pesticides applied in that area may be carried to their habitat by air currents. Birds are shown regardless of whether they are resident or migratory. Relevant birds on the county list should be considered regard-less of whether they appear on a quad list.

**Plants**

Any plants on your list are ones *that have actually been observed* in the quad or quads covered by the list. We have also included either a county species list or a list of species in nearby quads. We recommend that you check your project area for these plants. Plants may exist in an area without ever having been detected there.

**Surveying**

Some of the species on your list may not be affected by your project. A trained biologist or botanist, familiar with the habitat requirements of the species on your list, should determine whether they or habitats suitable for them may be affected by your project. We recommend that your surveys include any proposed and candidate species on your list. For plant surveys, we recommend using the enclosed *Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Species*. The results of your surveys should be published in any environmental documents prepared for your project.

**State-Listed Species**

If a species has been listed as threatened or endangered by the State of California, but not by us nor by the National Marine Fisheries Service, it will appear on your list as a Species of Concern. *However you should contact the California Department of Fish and Game for official information about these species.* Call (916) 322-2493 or write Marketing Manager, California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Data Base, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

**Your Responsibilities Under the Endangered Species Act**

All plants and animals identified as *listed* on Enclosure A are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations prohibit the *take* of a federally listed wildlife species. Take is defined by the Act as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect" any such animal. Take may include significant habitat

modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or shelter (50 CFR §17.3).

Take incidental to an otherwise lawful activity may be authorized by one of two procedures:

If a Federal agency is involved with the permitting, funding, or carrying out of a project that may result in take, then that agency must engage in a *formal consultation* with the Service. During formal consultation, the Federal agency, the applicant and the Service work together to avoid or minimize the impact on listed species and their habitat. Such consultation would result in a *biological opinion* by the Service addressing the anticipated effect of the project on listed and proposed species. The opinion may authorize a limited level of incidental take.

If no Federal agency is involved with the project, and federally listed species may be taken as part of the project, then you, the applicant, should apply for an *incidental take permit*. The Service may issue such a permit if you submit a satisfactory conservation plan for the species that would be affected by your project. Should your survey determine that federally listed or proposed species occur in the area and are likely to be affected by the project, we recommend that you work with this office and the California Department of Fish and Game to develop a plan that minimizes the project's direct and indirect impacts to listed species and compensates for project-related loss of habitat. You should include the plan in any environmental documents you file.

### **Critical Habitat**

When a species is listed as endangered or threatened, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation may be designated as *critical habitat*. These areas may require special management considerations or protection. They provide needed space for growth and normal behavior; food, water, air, light, other nutritional or physiological requirements; cover or shelter; and sites for breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring, germination or seed dispersal.

Although critical habitat may be designated on private or State lands, activities on these lands are not restricted unless there is Federal involvement in the activities or direct harm to listed wildlife.

If any species has proposed or designated critical habitat within a quad, there will be a separate line for this on the species list. Maps and boundary descriptions of the critical habitat may be found in the *Federal Register*. The information is also reprinted in the *Code of Federal Regulations* (50 CFR 17.95).

### **Candidate Species**

We recommend that you address impacts to *candidate* species. We put plants and animals on our candidate list when we have enough scientific information to eventually propose them for listing as threatened or endangered. By considering these species early in your planning process you may be able to avoid the problems that could develop if one of these candidates was listed before the end of your project.

### **Species of Concern**

Your list may contain a section called *Species of Concern*. This is an informal term that refers to those species that the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office believes might be in need of concentrated

conservation actions. Such conservation actions vary depending on the health of the populations and degree and types of threats. At one extreme, there may only need to be periodic monitoring of populations and threats to the species and its habitat. At the other extreme, a species may need to be listed as a Federal threatened or endangered species. Species of concern receive no legal protection and the use of the term does not necessarily mean that the species will eventually be proposed for listing as a threatened or endangered species.

### **Wetlands**

If your project will impact wetlands, riparian habitat, or other jurisdictional waters as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, you will need to obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Impacts to wetland habitats require site specific mitigation and monitoring. For questions regarding wetlands, please contact Mark Littlefield of this office at (916) 414-6580.

### **Updates**

Our database is constantly updated as species are proposed, listed and delisted. If you address proposed, candidate and special concern species in your planning, this should not be a problem. We also continually strive to make our information as accurate as possible. Sometimes we learn that a particular species has a different range than we thought. This should not be a problem if you consider the species on the county that we have enclosed. If you have a long-term project or if your project is delayed, please contact us for a current list. You can also find out the current status of a species by going to the Service's Internet page: [www.fws.gov](http://www.fws.gov).

## ENCLOSURE C

### GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING AND REPORTING BOTANICAL INVENTORIES FOR FEDERALLY LISTED, PROPOSED AND CANDIDATE PLANTS (September 23, 1996)

These guidelines describe protocols for conducting botanical inventories for federally listed, proposed and candidate plants, and describe minimum standards for reporting results. The Service will use, in part, the information outlined below in determining whether the project under consideration may affect any listed, proposed or candidate plants, and in determining the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects.

Field inventories should be conducted in a manner that will locate listed, proposed, or candidate species (target species) that may be present. The entire project area requires a botanical inventory, except developed agricultural lands. The field investigator(s) should:

1. Conduct inventories at the appropriate times of year when target species are present and identifiable. Inventories will include all potential habitats. Multiple site visits during a field season may be necessary to make observations during the appropriate phenological stage of all target species.
2. If available, use a regional or local reference population to obtain a visual image of the target species and associated habitat(s). If access to reference populations is not available, investigators should study specimens from local herbaria.
3. List every species observed and compile a comprehensive list of vascular plants for the entire project site. Vascular plants need to be identified to a taxonomic level which allows rarity to be determined.
4. Report results of botanical field inventories that include:
  - a. a description of the biological setting, including plant community, topography, soils, potential habitat of target species, and an evaluation of environmental conditions, such as timing or quantity of rainfall, which may influence the performance and expression of target species
  - b. a map of project location showing scale, orientation, project boundaries, parcel size, and map quadrangle name
  - c. survey dates and survey methodology(ies)
  - d. if a reference population is available, provide a written narrative describing the target species reference population(s) used, and date(s) when observations were made
  - e. a comprehensive list of all vascular plants occurring on the project site for each habitat type
  - f. current and historic land uses of the habitat(s) and degree of site alteration
  - g. presence of target species off-site on adjacent parcels, if known
  - h. an assessment of the biological significance or ecological quality of the project site in a local and regional context
5. If target species is(are) found, report results that additionally include:

- a. a map showing federally listed, proposed and candidate species distribution as they relate to the proposed project
  - b. if target species is (are) associated with wetlands, a description of the direction and integrity of flow of surface hydrology. If target species is (are) affected by adjacent off-site hydrological influences, describe these factors.
  - c. the target species phenology and microhabitat, an estimate of the number of individuals of each target species per unit area; identify areas of high, medium and low density of target species over the project site, and provide acres of occupied habitat of target species. Investigators could provide color slides, photos or color copies of photos of target species or representative habitats to support information or descriptions contained in reports.
  - d. the degree of impact(s), if any, of the proposed project as it relates to the potential unoccupied habitat of target habitat.
6. Document findings of target species by completing California Native Species Field Survey Form(s) and submit form(s) to the Natural Diversity Data Base. Documentation of determinations and/or voucher specimens may be useful in cases of taxonomic ambiguities, habitat or range extensions.
  7. Report as an addendum to the original survey, any change in abundance and distribution of target plants in subsequent years. Project sites with inventories older than three years from the current date of project proposal submission will likely need additional survey. Investigators need to assess whether an additional survey(s) is (are) needed.
  8. Adverse conditions may prevent investigator(s) from determining presence or identifying some target species in potential habitat(s) of target species. Disease, drought, predation, or herbivory may preclude the presence or identification of target species in any year. An additional botanical inventory(ies) in a subsequent year(s) may be required if adverse conditions occur in a potential habitat(s). Investigator(s) may need to discuss such conditions.
  9. Guidance from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regarding plant and plant community surveys can be found in Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Developments on Rare and Endangered Plants and Plant Communities, 1984. Please contact the CDFG Regional Office for questions regarding the CDFG guidelines and for assistance in determining any applicable State regulatory requirements.

## APPENDIX B

---

### Observed Plant and Animal Species

**PLANTS OBSERVED DURING THE FIELD SURVEY:**

field mustard (*Brassica rapa ssp. sylvestris*)  
ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*)  
soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*)  
yellow star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*)  
Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*)  
willow smartweed (*Polygonum lapathifolium*)  
Himalaya berry (*Rubus discolor*)  
Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*)  
milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*)  
cultivated wheat (*Triticum aestivum*)

**ANIMALS OBSERVED DURING THE FIELD SURVEY:**

red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*)  
rock dove (*Columba livia*)  
mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*)

**APPENDIX C**

---

**May & Associates, Inc. Habitat Assessment Report**



August 7, 2002

Catherine LeBlanc  
Hughes Environmental Consultants  
521 Antioch Drive  
Davis, CA 95616

**RE: Sacramento County – Truxel 3 project**

Dear Ms. LeBlanc:

At your request, we have conducted a records search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB 2002) and California Native Plant Society database (CNPS 2002) for special-status species occurrences and conducted a biological survey of the Truxel 3 project site in Sacramento County, California.

## **METHODS**

May & Associates, Inc's biologist reviewed the CNDDDB and CNPS databases and project material prior to conducting field surveys. May & Associates, Inc's biologist and botanist then conducted habitat assessment to investigate potential habitat for endangered/special-status species on July 10, 2002. The site investigation consisted of a walking survey of the entire site.

## **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The Truxel 3 project site is located north of Highway 80 at the corner of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Blvd (Figure 1). The site was formerly agricultural land and portions of the site have been covered with fill material to a depth of two or three feet covering the native soil profile. The site is currently fallow, but has been mowed for weed control. An abandoned irrigation ditch forms the eastern boundary of the site. The ditch, although it appears to be no longer used for irrigation, supports a dense growth of Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*).

## **RESULTS**

The CNDDDB and CNPS records identified 14 special status-species from the Taylor Monument and Rio Linda 7.5 minute quadrangles (Table 1) (i.e. three plant species and 11 wildlife species) in the vicinity of the project site. There are no known occurrences of special-status species at the project site (NDDDB 2002, CNPS 2002).

Three special-status plant species including Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*), dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*), and legenere (*Legenere limosa*) are known to occur in seasonal wetland habitats (i.e. vernal pools) in the vicinity of the project site (NDDDB 2002), however, the Truxel 3 project site lacks seasonal wetland habitats for these species, therefore they are not expected to be present.

Of the 11 wildlife species identified by the CNDDDB records, four have potential to use the project site as foraging habitat (i.e., Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), western burrowing owl (*Athene unicularia hypugea*), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*)). The only tree on the project site is a small black willow (*Salix gooddingii*) and no nests were observed at the time of the survey. The nearest recorded Swainson's hawk nest is on the Taylor Monument USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle along the Sacramento River located three miles west of the project site. The CNDDDB (2002) also reports a white-tailed kite occurrence on the Rio Linda USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle 6.5 miles

Figure 2. Map of Habitats at the  
Truxel Road Project, APN 225-0170-043  
City of Sacramento, CA

Photo Source: USGS rectified digital orthophotos  
(1 m resolution), August 1998.

**MAY & ASSOC., Inc.**  
2000 1150  
1710 175 2500

Scale: 1" = 200'

File: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: July 2002  
Sheet 1  
of 1

RUDERAL  
MATERIAL

RUDERAL  
ON FILL  
MATERIAL

RUDERAL  
MATERIAL

BLACK WILLOW

BRAMBLE




Table 1. Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur at the Truxel 3 Project Site in Sacramento County

Common and Scientific Name	Legal Status* Federal/State	Distribution	Habitat Association	Identification Period	Comments
<b>WILDLIFE</b>					
Great blue heron <i>Ardea herodias</i> and Great egret <i>Ardea alba</i> (rockery sites)	--/CSC	Throughout California, concentrated along waterways and reservoirs and ponds in the Central Valley and coastal valleys.	Nests in large tree groves. Forages on rocky shores, saltwater marshes, kelp beds, estuaries, mudflats, lagoons, marshes, lakes, rivers and occasionally flooded fields.	Year-round	No record; No nesting habitat present
Swainson's hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i> (nesting)	--/T	Lower Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Klamath Basin, and Butte Valley.	Nests in oaks or cottonwoods in or near riparian habitats; forages in grasslands, irrigated pastures, and grain fields.	Spring and Summer	Not observed; suitable foraging habitat is present, no suitable nest trees on site
Tricolored blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	SC;MNBMC/SSC	Sacramento-San Joaquin Valleys and low foothills of coast ranges and the Sierra Nevada; Great Basin.	Nests colonially in vicinity of freshwater marshes. Prefers dense stands of tules, cattails, and brambles.	Year-round	Not observed; suitable nesting habitat present (blackberry bramble)
Western burrowing owl <i>Athene cunicularia hypugae</i>	SC;MNBMC/SSC	Central and southern coastal habitats, Central Valley, Great Basin and deserts.	Open annual grasslands or perennial grasslands, deserts, and scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Dependent upon burrowing mammals (especially California ground squirrel) for burrows.	Year-round	Not observed; suitable foraging and limited nesting habitat (i.e., ground-squirrel burrow) present on site
Black-crowned night heron <i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>	--/--	Central Valley; coastal valley and mid-elevation mountains	nests in riparian trees and shrubs and emergent vegetations forages in streams and wetlands and rice fields	Year-round	Not observed; no suitable nesting habitat is present
White-tailed kite (black-shouldered kite) <i>Elaeus leucurus</i>	MNBMC/FP	Central Valley and low foothills of Sierra Nevada.	Agricultural lands and open stages of most herbaceous habitats. Nests in oak, willow, or other tree stands.	Year-round	Not observed; suitable foraging; habitat present
Susacantha Spinnail <i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	T/SSC	Formerly throughout Sacramento-San Joaquin River drainage, CA; now restricted to San Francisco Bay Delta and lower Sacramento River.	Backwaters and pools of rivers; lakes. Tolerant of brackish water.		No habitat present
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle <i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	T/--	Central Valley and surrounding foothills below 1,500 feet elevations.	Dependent on elderberry shrubs (host plant) as a food plant. Potential habitat is shrubs with stems 1 inch in diameter within Central Valley.	Year round for host plant and exit holes March-June for adults	No habitat present
Giant Garter Snake <i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	T/FP	Occurs in the Central Valley from Fresno north to the Gridley/Sutter Buttes area; has been extirpated from areas south of Fresno.	Found in sloughs, canals, and other small waterways, where there is a prey base of small fish and amphibians; requires grassy banks and emergent vegetation for basking, and areas of high ground protected from flooding during winter.	March-October	No habitat present

**Appendix A. Species Identified at the Truxel 3 Project Site in Sacramento County.**

**WILDLIFE**

**Columbidae:**

Rock dove

*Columba livia*

**Mimidae:**

Northern mockingbird

*Mimus polyglottos*

**Emberizidae:**

Red-winged blackbird

*Agelaius phoeniceus*

**PLANT**

**Rosaceae:**

Himalaya berry

*Rubus discolor*

**Salicaceae:**

Black willow

*Salix gooddingii*

**Polygonaceae:**

Willow smartweed

*Polygonum lapathifolium*

**Poaceae:**

Harding grass

*Phalaris aquatica*

Soft chess

*Bromus hordeaceus*

Ripgut grass

*Bromus diandrus*

Cultivated wheat

*Triticum aestivum*

**Brassicaceae:**

Field mustard

*Brassica rapa ssp. sylvestris*

**Asteraceae:**

Milk thistle

*Silybum marianum*

Yellow star-thistle

*Centaurea solstitialis*

**TABLE 2**  
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES POTENTIALLY PRESENT WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
<b>PLANTS</b>		
Dwarf downingia ( <i>Downingia pusilla</i> )	-I/2	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in Vernal pools in valley and foothill grasslands, below 1,500 ft. Blooms March-May. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Bogg's Lake hedge hyssop ( <i>Gratiola heterosepala</i> )	-E/1B	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in vernal pools in the Central Valley and other scattered locations in northern California, below 4,000 ft. Blooms April-June. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Legenere ( <i>Legenere limosa</i> )	SC/-1B	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in vernal pools below 130 ft. Blooms May-June. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
<b>ANIMALS</b>		
<b>Invertebrates</b>		
Antioch Dunes anthicid beetle ( <i>Anthicus antiochensis</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in loose sand on sandbars and sand dunes. Currently only known from Grand Island and from in and around Sandy Beach County Park in Sacramento County. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Sacramento anthicid beetle ( <i>Anthicus sacramento</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Habitat includes sand slip-faces among willows. Known only from dune area at mouth of Sacramento River; the western tip of Grand Island, Sacramento County; dunes near Rio Vista, Solano County; and Ord Ferry Bridge in Butte County. Not known from the project area. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Vernal pool fairy shrimp ( <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i> )	T/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in large vernal pools and seasonal wetlands in the Central Valley, central Coast Ranges, and South Coast Ranges. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Midvalley fairy shrimp ( <i>Branchinecta mesovallensis</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> This is a newly described species that inhabits vernal pools in the following counties within the Central Valley: Sacramento, Solano, Merced, Madera, San Joaquin, Fresno, and Contra Costa. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
Pacific lamprey ( <i>Lampetra tridentata</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Spawns in gravel riffles and runs of clear coastal streams, feeds primarily in ocean. Ammocoetes found in silt, mud, and sand of shallow eddies and backwaters of streams. Found from Alaska south to the Santa Ana River, off Baja, and along the Pacific Coast of Asia. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, this species cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Central Valley steelhead ( <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> )	T/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in cool, perennial streams and estuaries of the Central Valley. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, salmonids cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon ( <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> )	T/T/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in cool, perennial, coastal streams and estuaries of the Pacific Coast. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, salmonids cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon ( <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> )	FC/CSC/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in cool, perennial, coastal streams and estuaries of the Pacific Coast. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, salmonids cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Central Valley winter-run chinook salmon ( <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> )	E/E/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in cool, perennial, coastal streams and estuaries of the Arctic and Pacific Coast. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, salmonids cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Sacramento splittail ( <i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i> )	T/CSC/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in backwaters and pools of rivers and lakes. Formerly found throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin River drainages. Now restricted to the San Francisco Bay-Delta and the lower Sacramento River. No connection exists between the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and the Sacramento River; therefore, this species cannot move from the River to the Canal. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
Giant Garter Snake ( <i>Thamnophis couchi gigas</i> )	T/T/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in Central Valley sloughs, canals, and other small waterways, where there is a prey base of small fish and amphibians. Requires grassy banks and emergent vegetation for basking, and areas of high ground protected from flooding during winter. Known from the canals and sloughs in the Natomas Basin, including the West and East Drainage Canals. There are no known occurrences in the Natomas Main Drainage Canal, however the species is assumed to be present. Appropriate aquatic and upland habitats are present within the project area. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
<b>Birds</b>		
Tricolored blackbird ( <i>Agelaius tricolor</i> )	SC/CSC/-	<b>Potentially present within the project area.</b> Nests colonially in the vicinity of freshwater marshes. Prefers dense stands of tules and cattails. <b>Suitable nesting habitat is present within the project area.</b>
Grasshopper sparrow ( <i>Ammodramus savannarum</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Occurs in dry, dense grasslands, especially those with a variety of grasses and tall forbs and scattered shrubs for singing perches. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Great egret ( <i>Ardea alba</i> )	-/-/- (included on CNDDB— rookeries)	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> This species nests colonially in large trees. The riparian woodland within the project area may support rookery habitat for this species. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Great blue heron ( <i>Ardea herodias</i> )	-/-/- (included on CNDDB— rookeries)	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> This species nests colonially in tall trees, cliff sides, and sequestered spots in marshes. The riparian woodland within the project area may support rookery habitat for this species. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Short-eared owl ( <i>Asio flammeus</i> )	SC/CSC/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Primarily a winter migrant to California. No breeding historically known from vicinity of project. Usually found in large, open grassland expanses with elevated sites for perches, and dense vegetation for roosting and nesting. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Western burrowing owl ( <i>Athene cunicularia hypugea</i> )	SC/CSC/-	<b>Potentially present within the project area.</b> Occurs in open annual grasslands or perennial grasslands, deserts, and scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Dependent upon burrowing mammals (especially California ground squirrel) for burrows. <b>Suitable foraging habitat is present within the project area.</b>

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
Vaux's swift ( <i>Chaetura vauxi</i> )	SC/CSC/--	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Prefers redwood and Douglas-fir habitats with nest-sites in large hollow trees and snags, especially tall, burned-out stubs. Fairly common migrant throughout most of California in April and May, and August and September. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Mountain plover ( <i>Charadrius montanus</i> )	PT/CSC/--	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Habitat for this species includes open plains or rolling hills with short grasses or very sparse vegetation; nearby bodies of water are not needed. May use newly plowed or sprouting grain fields. Winters in California, and is found in the Central Valley south of Yuba County. No known wintering areas in the Natomas Basin. Not known from the project area. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Black tern ( <i>Chlidonias niger</i> )	SC/CSC/--	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Restricted to freshwater habitats while breeding. Not known to breed in the Central Valley. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Western yellow-billed cuckoo ( <i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i> )	-/E/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Nests in extensive willow-dominated riparian forest with dense understory, along the broad, lower flood-bottoms of larger river systems. In the Sacramento Valley, also known to utilize orchards. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
White-tailed (=black-shouldered) kite ( <i>Elanus leucurus</i> )	-/FP/-	<b>Potentially present within the project area.</b> Habitat includes agricultural lands and open stages of most herbaceous habitats. Nests in dense oak, willow, or other tree stands. <b>Suitable foraging habitat is present within the project area.</b>
Little willow flycatcher ( <i>Empidonax traillii brewsteri</i> )	SC/E/--	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Habitat for this species includes riparian deciduous shrub and large, wet meadows with abundant willows for breeding at elevations between 2,000 and 8,000 ft. The minimum size meadow for breeding is 0.62 acres. Summer range includes a narrow strip along the eastern Sierra Nevada from Shasta County to Kern County, another strip along the western Sierra Nevada from El Dorado County to Madera County. No longer nests in the Central Valley. Not known from the project area. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
Black-crowned night heron ( <i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i> )	-/-/ (included on CNDDDB— rookeries)	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Although they frequent wooded swamps, ponds, lakes and tropical mangroves, they have also been found to take advantage of rice fields and other diverse habitats. They keep close to water and vegetation such as reeds, trees and mangroves where they roost and take cover. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Nuttall's woodpecker ( <i>Picoides nuttallii</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> A common, permanent resident of low-elevation riparian deciduous and oak habitats. Found in dead (occasionally live) trunk or limb of willow, sycamore, cottonwood, or alder; rarely in oaks. Known from the Central Valley. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
White-faced ibis ( <i>Plegadis chihi</i> )	SC/CSC/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Habitat for this species includes freshwater marshes with tules, cattails, and rushes, but this species may nest in trees and forage in flooded agricultural fields. Not known from the project area. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Bank swallow ( <i>Riparia riparia</i> )	-/T/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Nests in bluffs or banks adjacent to water where the soil consists of sand or sandy loam to allow digging. Not known from the project area, and nesting habitat is not present. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
Rufous hummingbird ( <i>Selasphorus rufus</i> )	SC/-/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> Only occurs during spring and fall migration in the vicinity of the project area. Found in a wide variety of habitats that contain nectar-producing flowers. <b>Suitable habitat is not present within the project area.</b>
<b>Mammals</b>		
Pacific western big-eared bat ( <i>Corynorhinus [=Plecotus] townsendii townsendii</i> )	SC/CSC/-	<b>Unlikely within the project area.</b> This species, while found throughout California, requires undisturbed caves, mines, or buildings for roosting. Is primarily found in humid, coastal regions of Northern and South-Central California. Not known from the project area. <b>Suitable roosting habitat is not present within the project area.</b>

SPECIES	STATUS * (USFWS /CA/CNPS)	COMMENTS
<b>Status*</b>		
USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service special-status species; USFS = U.S. Forest Service special-status species; CA = California Department of Fish and Game special-status species; CNPS = California Native Plant Society special-status species		
<b>Federal</b>		
E	=	Endangered
T	=	Threatened
PT	=	Proposed Threatened
SC	=	Species of Concern (former Category 2 Candidate)
D	=	Delisted
PD	=	Proposed for Delisting
<b>NOTE:</b> Per a notice in the February 28, 1996 Federal Register, the USFWS has reviewed and altered the classification status of all candidate species. Former Category 1 candidates are now referred to as candidate species. The Category 2 candidate designation is discontinued. Former Category 2 candidates are now referred to as Species of Concern. Former Category 3 candidate species are not candidates for federal listing, and this designation is discontinued.		
<b>State</b>		
E	=	Endangered
T	=	Threatened
CSC	=	California Special Concern species
FP	=	Fully Protected
<b>CNPS</b>		
List 1B	=	Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
List 2	=	Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere

**APPENDIX D**

---

**Foothill Associates, Biological Survey Letter Report**



# FOOTHILL ASSOCIATES

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING • PLANNING • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

June 13, 2002

Niki Doan  
AKT Development Corporation  
7700 College Town Drive, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95826-2397

Dear Niki:

At your request Foothill Associates has completed a special-status species survey on the  $\pm$ 13-acre Truxel Property (APN 225-0170-043), located in the City of Sacramento. A Foothill Associates biologist conducted the survey on June 12, 2002. The survey consisted of walking two north/south transects on the property, one along the eastern boundary and one along the western boundary.

The project site is a roughly triangular parcel bounded on the west by Gateway Park Boulevard, on the south by Truxel Road, and on the east by agricultural cropland. The site is mostly level, with the southern third bearing a large deposit of soil, concrete and asphalt rubble, etc. A chain-link fence runs along the western boundary of the site. Surrounding land uses include a large retail center across Truxel Road southwest of the site, and warehouse/commercial uses to the north and west, and cropland to the east.

The project site supports primarily ruderal (weedy) vegetation, consistent with disturbed sites and vacant lots in urban settings. Dominant plant species on the site include milk thistle, star-thistle, and riggut brome. Much of the site is an almost pure stand of milk thistle, a non-native invasive weed. An irrigation canal runs along the eastern edge of the property. This canal was dry on the date of the survey and appears to have been dry for some time. The canal is virtually covered with the non-native Himalayan blackberry. Over 99% of the canal is covered by blackberry from bank to bank, completely concealing the banks and bottom of the canal. A large willow is growing next to the canal in the southeastern corner of the site. Wildlife observed on the project site included black-tailed jackrabbit, western kingbird, mourning dove, and ring-necked pheasant. The enclosed Figure 1 contains representative ground level photos of the site.

The project site provides minimal habitat for wildlife, due to the size and condition of the property, the surrounding land uses, and the predominance of ruderal vegetation. The presence of the dense stand of milk thistle greatly reduces the potential for Swainson's hawk foraging. The dry irrigation canal does not provide the aquatic habitat necessary for giant garter snake, and the dense canopy of blackberry further reduces its value as habitat. No other special-status species or their habitats were observed on the project site.

Page 2 of 2


Please contact me if you have any questions, or if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Kenneth D. Whitney, Ph.D.

enclosure




Typical Site Vegetation



Dense Blackberry Vines Over Canal



Canal and Ruderal Vegetation



Canal From Southeastern Corner of Site

Photo Date: June 12, 2002

**RESOLUTION NO. 2003-666**

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL

ON DATE OF SEP 23 2003

**A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ADOPTING THE MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN FOR TRUXEL 3 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.**

(APN: 225-0170-043)  
(P00-123)

**WHEREAS**, the Environmental Coordinator has prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the above identified project;

**WHEREAS**, the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for the above-identified project pursuant to the requirements of CEQA;

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Negative Declaration and comments received during the public review process were considered prior to action being taken on the project;

**WHEREAS**, based upon the Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review process, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, provided that mitigation measures are added to the above identified project.

**WHEREAS**, this Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis;

**WHEREAS**, the Environmental Coordinator has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring Plan for ensuring compliance and implementation of the mitigation measures as prescribed in the Initial Study for the above identified project; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, the City of Sacramento requires that a Mitigation Monitoring Plan be developed for implementing mitigation measures as identified in the Initial Study for the project;

---


**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666


DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO THAT:**

1. The Negative Declaration for Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development (P00-1213) be ratified.
2. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan is approved for the proposed Truxel 3 Planned Unit Development project based upon the following findings:
  - a. One or more mitigation measures have been added to the above identified project;
  - b. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan, has been prepared to ensure compliance and implementation of the mitigation measures for the above identified project, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1.

  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

  
CITY CLERK

P00-123

---

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666

DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

**EXHIBIT 1 – Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**TRUXEL 3 PROJECT (P00-123)  
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) has been required by and prepared for the City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department, Environmental Planning Services, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21081.6.

**SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

**Project Name / File Number:** Truxel 3 Project (P00-123)  
**Owner/Developer- Name:** Armrod Charitable Foundation, Eleni Tsakopoulos  
**Address:** 7700 College Town Drive, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95826

**Project Location / Legal Description of Property (if recorded):** The Project is located within the North Natomas Community Plan area. The project site is located at the southeast intersection of Truxel Road and Gateway Park Boulevard. (APN: 225-0170-043).

**Project Description:** The proposed Truxel 3 Project would consist of establishing a Planned Unit Development for developing approximately 5.0± gross acres (2.8 net acres) of vacant land for the purpose of constructing Highway Commercial uses. The Truxel 3 project would provide highway commercial uses for both the North Natomas Community and travelers of I-80. Appropriate off-street parking would be required in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance for projects being constructed within the Planned Unit Development.

Specific entitlements being requested for the proposed project include:

- A. Development Agreement
- B. Rezone - to Highway Commercial
- C. Planned Unit Development (PUD) Establishment (PUD Guidelines and PUD Schematic Plan)

**SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Plan includes mitigation for Seismicity, Soils, and Geology; Air Quality; Biological Resources; and Cultural Resources. The intent of the Plan is to prescribe and enforce a means for properly and successfully implementing the mitigation measures as identified within the Initial Study for this project. Unless otherwise noted, the cost of implementing the mitigation measures as prescribed by this Plan shall be funded by the owner/developer identified above. This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) is designed to aid the City of Sacramento in its implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures adopted for the proposed project.

---

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666  
DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

## EXHIBIT 1 – Mitigation Monitoring Plan

The mitigation measures have been taken verbatim from the Initial Study and are assigned the same number they have in the document. The MMP describes the actions that must take place to implement each mitigation measure, the timing of those actions, and the entities responsible for implementing and monitoring the actions. The developer will be responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures contained with the MMP. The City of Sacramento will be responsible for ensuring compliance.

### MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

#### Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires review of any plan or project that could have significant adverse effects on the environment. In 1988, CEQA was amended to require reporting on and monitoring of mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process. This MMP is designed to aid the City of Sacramento in its implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures adopted for the Proposed Project.

#### MMP Components

The components of each monitoring form are addressed briefly, below.

Mitigation Measure: All mitigation measures that were identified in the Initial Study are presented, and numbered accordingly. The mitigation measures are presented by topic (e.g., Air Quality).

Implementing Responsibility: This item identifies the entity that will undertake the required action.

Monitoring Responsibility: This item identifies the entity that will monitor the required action.

Compliance Standards: This item identifies the specific actions that are required in each mitigation measure.

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

Verification of Compliance: The individual assigned to assure compliance with identified mitigation measures will initial the form when the measure has been successfully implemented. The individual assigned to assure compliance will date the form when the measure has been successfully implemented.

---

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666

DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

**EXHIBIT 1 - Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**TRUXEL 3 PROJECT (P00-123)  
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

Mitigation Measure	Implementing Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
			Compliance Standards	Timing	Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)
<p><b>3. Seismicity, Soils, and Geology:</b></p> <p>SSG-1. If groundwater were encountered during excavation activities, pumped water shall be channeled to an infiltration basin, located within an upland area of the construction activities and would eventually percolate into the groundwater. Upon percolation of all pumped water, the infiltration basin shall be backfilled and revegetated or developed per City and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.</p>	Applicant	City Planning & Building Department, Department of Utilities, and Department of Public Works.	The listed measure shall be included on all construction plans.	Mitigation measures shall be implemented in the field during construction activities.	
<p><b>5. Air Quality:</b></p> <p>AQ-1. Exposed soil shall be watered with adequate frequency to keep soil moist at all times.</p> <p>AQ-2. Loads of haul/dump trucks shall be covered securely.</p> <p>AQ-3. Any exposed piles of dirt, sand, gravel, or other construction debris shall be enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily.</p> <p>AQ-4. All dirt and mud which has been generated from or deposited by construction equipment going to and from the construction site along neighborhood streets shall be removed at a minimum of three times per week.</p> <p>AQ-5. Equipment idling shall be kept to a minimum when equipment is not in use. No piece of equipment shall be left to idle in one place for more than 30 minutes.</p> <p>AQ-6. On-site vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces.</p>	Applicant	City Planning & Building Department, Department of Public Works and SMAQMD	The applicant shall include the listed measures on all grading plans (the City shall not approve any construction plans without them).	Mitigation measures shall be implemented in the field during grading and construction activities.	

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666

DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

**EXHIBIT 1 – Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**TRUXEL 3 PROJECT (P00-123)  
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

		VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
		Compliance Standards	Timing	Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)
	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Implementing Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Responsibility</b>	
AQ-7.	Revegetate disturbed areas immediately after the completion of construction to reduce wind erosion.			
<b>7. Biological:</b>		Applicant		
BR-1.	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall either: (i) provide ½ acre of mitigation land that meets the requirements of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for each acre of land authorized for disturbance; or (ii) pay the required NBHCP fees. No permit can be issued unless one of these has occurred. If the applicant acquires land and transfers it to the Conservancy, the applicant must pay that portion of the NBHCP fees other than the acquisition portion. Applicant land acquisitions must be approved in advance by the Conservancy.	City Planning & Building Department; Department of Public Works, The Natomas Basin Conservancy. CA Dept. Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.	Mitigation Measures, including construction-timing restrictions shall be included on the Construction Specifications. Pre-construction biological surveys shall be completed as specified and submitted with grading/building plans. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the NBHCP.	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permit, measures identified on plans shall be verified for compliance. The Building Division and Dept of Public Works shall assure that measures are identified on construction plans and confirm compliance prior to issuance of any grading or building permit. Measures shall also be implemented concurrent with construction activities.
BR-2.	A pre-construction survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist in order to determine the presence and status of special-status species and their habitats within the project area, including Swainson's hawk, western burrowing owl, white-tailed kite, and tricolored blackbird. The results of the pre-construction surveys along with recommended take minimization measures shall be documented in a report and submitted to the USFWS and the CDFG. If necessary, the City shall implement specific take minimization measures as directed by the CDFG and the USFWS.			
BR-3.	The project applicant/developer shall: (1) comply with all requirements of the NBHCP, together with any additional requirements specified in the North Natomas Community Plan EIR; (2) comply with any additional mitigation measures identified in the NBHCP EIR/EIS; and (3) comply with all conditions in the incidental take permits issued by the USFWS and CDFG.			

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666

DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003

**EXHIBIT 1 – Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**TRUXEL 3 PROJECT (P00-123)  
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

Mitigation Measure	Implementing Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
			Compliance Standards	Timing	Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)
<p><b>11. Cultural Resources:</b></p> <p>CR-1. If subsurface archaeological, historical, or paleontological remains are discovered during construction, work in the area of the find shall stop immediately. A qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.</p> <p>CR-2. If human burials are encountered, all work in the area of the find shall stop immediately and the Sacramento County Coroner's office shall be notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendants would be notified and recommendations for treatment solicited (CEQA Section 15064.5; Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and 5097.98).</p>	Applicant	City Planning & Building Department, Department of Public Works	Notes shall be included on the Construction Specifications.	Measures shall be implemented in field during grading and construction activities.	

**FOR CITY CLERK USE ONLY**

RESOLUTION NO.: 2003-666

DATE ADOPTED: SEP 23 2003



## RESOLUTION NO. 2005-914

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

December 13, 2005

**ADOPTING THE NOTICE OF DECISION AND FINDINGS OF FACT FOR SONIC RESTAURANT; CONSIDERING THE ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AS AMENDED WITH AN ADDENDUM; AND APPROVING THE APPEAL AND THE SPECIAL PERMIT FOR A DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE FACILITY, LOCATED IN THE TRUXEL 3 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SOUTHEAST OF TRUXEL ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD. (APN: 225-0170-043) (P05-022)**

### BACKGROUND

- A. On October 13, 2005, the City Planning Commission considered the Adopted Negative Declaration as Amended with an Addendum,
- B. On October 13, 2005, the City Planning Commission denied the special permit to develop a drive-through facility for Sonic restaurant;
- C. On October 21, 2005, an appeal of the decision of the City Planning Commission to deny the drive-through facility for Sonic restaurant was received by the City; and
- D. On December 13, 2005, the City Council heard and considered evidence in the above-mentioned matter.

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

- Section 1. At the regular meeting of December 13, 2005, the City Council heard and considered evidence in the above entitled matter. Based on verbal and documentary evidence at said hearing, the City Council took the following actions for the location listed above:
- A. Considered the Adopted Negative Declaration as Amended with an Addendum;
  - B. Approved the Special Permit to develop a drive-through service facility on a 0.88± net acre parcel in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone.

These actions were made based upon the following findings of fact and subject to the following conditions:

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- A. Considered the Adopted Negative Declaration as Amended with an Addendum: The City Council finds that a Negative Declaration (P00-123) was previously approved by the City Council on September 23, 2003, and that pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15162 and 15164), for the reasons set forth below, no additional environmental review is required and an Addendum to this prior Negative Declaration has been prepared:
1. No substantial changes are proposed to the project which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration;
  2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project was undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration; and
  3. No new information of substantial importance has been found that shows any of the following:
    - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Negative Declaration;
    - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Negative Declaration;
    - c. Mitigation measures previously found to be infeasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project; or
    - d. Mitigation measures which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.
- B. Special Permit: The Special Permit to develop a drive-through service facility in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone is **approved** on the following findings of fact:
1. The proposal, as conditioned, will not be detrimental to public welfare nor result in the creation of a public nuisance in that the facility will be built according to applicable requirements of the Zoning Code and Building Code;
  2. The proposal is based upon sound principles of land use due to its consistency with the North Natomas Community Plan which designates the site for Highway Commercial use and the zoning designation of Highway Commercial Planned Unit development (HC-PUD);
  3. The design and location of the facility will not contribute to increased congestion on public and private streets adjacent to the subject property; and

4. The design and location of the facility will not impede access to or exit from the lot serving the business, impair normal circulation within the lot or impede pedestrian movement through the site.

### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- B. The Special Permit to develop a drive-through service facility in the Highway Commercial Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) zone.**
- B1. The site layout shall be consistent with the approved plans shown on Exhibit A and B, unless otherwise conditioned. Any modifications shall be subject to approval by the Planning Division prior to issuance of building permits.
  - B2. A minimum stacking distance of one hundred eighty (180) feet shall be provided to each pick-up window or automated machine.
  - B3. Provide stacking space for at least four vehicles in advance of each ordering point and stacking space for at least four vehicles between each ordering point and pick-up window.
  - B4. Entrances to drive-through lanes shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet from driveways entering a public or private street or alley.
  - B5. The minimum width of each drive-through lane shall be eleven (11) feet. The entrance to the lane and the direction of traffic flow shall be clearly designated by signs and pavement marking or raised curbs.
  - B6. The special permit is revocable if congestion attributable to inadequate vehicle stacking space for the drive-through service facility regularly occurs on public or private streets or alleys, or the design of the facility creates a nuisance to adjacent properties and the management of the facility cannot alleviate the situation.
  - B7. One menu board sign per user shall be allowed. The menu board shall be internally illuminated, single-faced not to exceed a maximum of 6'-0" high by 4'-0" wide.
  - B8. The proposed signage will be subject to Planning Division review prior to the issuance of building permits.
  - B9. The walkway crossing the drive-through lane shall be marked and striped and a caution sign alerting motorists to pedestrians shall be installed.

#### **Table of Contents:**

Exhibit A	Site Plan – 1 page
Exhibit B	Elevation at Drive-Through – 1 page
Resolution No. 2005-914	December 13, 2005


Adopted by the City of Sacramento City Council on December 13, 2005 by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cohn, Fong, Hammond, McCarty, Pannell, Sheedy, Tretheway, Waters and Mayor Fargo.

Noes: None.


Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Heather Fargo

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Shirley Concolino, City Clerk



**STATISTICS**

T.G.I. RESTAURANT (75 SEAT)  
 PARKING REQUIRED  
 11 STALLS SEAT  
 SONIC RESTAURANT (24 SEAT)  
 PARKING REQUIRED  
 11 STALLS SEAT  
 TOTAL PARKING REQUIRED \*  
 22 STALLS  
 TOTAL PARKING PROVIDED \*  
 100 STALLS


\*NOTE: 100 STALLS AT SONIC RESTAURANT NOT A PART OF THIS PARKING COUNT.

**T.G.I. FRIDAY'S & SONIC RESTAURANTS**  
 TRUCKEE ROAD AND GATEWAY PARK BLVD.  
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

**SITE PLAN**  
 1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100

POS-022  
 REC'D 9/28/05

Exhibit B – Elevation at Drive-Through



**SONIC RESTAURANT**  
TRUXEL ROAD  
SACRAMENTO, CA

\_\_\_\_\_

Kueschke/Kuehli  
March  
Baker

\_\_\_\_\_

207 West 14th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811  
916.442.4444 FAX 916.442.4444

\_\_\_\_\_

10 11 12