City of
SACRAMENTO

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
SERVICES

300 Richards Boulevard
Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

California Truck & Trailer Repair Project (P21-002) The proposed project consists of a request to construct a new 9,450 square foot heavy truck and trailer repair facility on two vacant parcels zone Light Industrial (M-1S-LI-PUD) and Agriculture (A). This request includes rezoning the A zoned parcel to M-1S. The development includes construction of a two-story repair facility with an administrative and office building, and three attached repair bays. Additionally, the project is proposing two concrete aprons, truck and trailer parking area, vehicle parking area, and landscaping around and within the project site.

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

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

A copy of this document and all supportive is available on the City's EIR Webpage at:
http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports

Due to the COVID 19 crises and the current public counter closures, the document is not available for review in printed form. If you need assistance in reviewing the document please contact Ron Bess, Associate Planner at (916) 808-8272 or Rbess@cityofsacramento.org.

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

By: Ron Bess

Date: August 12, 2022

City of
SACRAMENTO

CALIFORNIA TRUCK & TRAILER REPAIR (P21-002)

INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ANTICIPATED SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

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

ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

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

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

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Reviews proposed project and states whether the project would have additional significant environmental effects (project-specific effects) that were not evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan.

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	BACKGROUND	4
II	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	6
III	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION	9
	1. Aesthetics	11
	2. Air Quality	14
	3. Biological Resources	26
	4. Cultural Resources	41
	5. Energy	48
	6. Geology and Soils	53
	7. Hazards	56
	8. Hydrology and Water Quality	59
	9. Noise	63
	10. Public Services	73
	11. Recreation	75
	12. Transportation and Circulation	77
	13. Tribal Cultural Resources	80
	14. Utilities and Service Systems	87
	15. Mandatory Findings of Significance	91
IV	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	94
V	DETERMINATION	95
REFERENCES CITED		99

LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title
1	Sacramento County Attainment Status
2	Maximum Exposed Individual Incremental Cancer Health Risk and Hazard Index
3	Construction and Operational GHG Emissions
4	Trees Located in the Study Area
5	Previous Studies Conducted within the Study Area
6	Exterior Incremental Noise Impact Standards for Noise-Sensitive Uses (dBA)
7	Noise Measurement Results
8	Operational On-Site Noise
9	Operational On-Site Noise, Cumulative Periods (dBA)
10	Off-site Traffic Noise Levels (dBA L_{DN})
11	Residential Change in Ambient Noise (dBA L_{DN})

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	Figures
B	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report
C	Biological Resources Evaluation Report
D	Cultural Resource Assessment Report
E	Noise and Vibration Assessment Report
F	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

Project Name and File Number: California Truck & Trailer Repair (P21-002)

Project Location: 121 Morrison Avenue, Sacramento CA 95838 (APN 250-0025-060; 250-0025-005)

Project Applicant: Mr. Dennis Clover
D.G. Clover Construction Co., Inc.
3241C Fruitridge Road
Yuba City, CA 95993

Project Planner: Angel Anguiano, Assistant Planner
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department

300 Richards Blvd. 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Environmental Planner: Ron Bess, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
Environmental Planning Services
300 Richards Blvd. 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Date Initial Study Completed: August 2022

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

The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR and is consistent with the land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site as set forth in the 2035 General Plan. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15176 (b) and (d).

The City has prepared the attached Initial Study to review the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR to determine their adequacy for the project (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and identify any potential new or additional project-specific significant environmental effects that were not analyzed in the Master EIR and any mitigation measures or alternatives that may avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance, if any.

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(d)) Policies included in the 2035 General Plan that reduce significant impacts identified in the Master EIR are identified and discussed.

The analysis contained in this IS/MND incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the 2035 General Plan Master EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The Master EIR and resolution is available for public review at the City of Sacramento's web site link listed below.

Due to concerns over COVID-19, the Community Development Department is closed to the public. This office is closed until further notice. A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed through the City's website at:

http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports

The City of Sacramento has circulated a Notice of Availability/Notice of Intent to adopt an MND (NOA/NOI) that confirms the City's intention to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and provides dates for the public review and comment period. The NOA/NOI is available on the City's website set forth above.

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Written comments should be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending September 16, 2022. Please send written responses to:

Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
Direct Line: (916) 808-8272
Rbess@cityofsacramento.org

PROJECT LOCATION

The project proposes development on an estimated 2.38-acre site located at 121 Morrison Avenue in North Sacramento in the City of Sacramento (City). The project consists of two Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN's): 250-0025-005 and 250-005-060. Refer to Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix A for a project site vicinity map and aerial image of the project site, respectively.

PROJECT SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USE

The project site is bounded by Harris Avenue to the north; existing light-industrial buildings to the east; Morrison Avenue to the south; and Opportunity Street to the west. The project site is primarily surrounded by light-industrial use developments and is located across the street from a single-family residential neighborhood. The single-family residential neighborhood is primarily single-story homes built in the late 20th century.

The proposed project is located in close proximity to Penske Truck Rental to the west, and Sacramento Truck Center to the north. Additionally, 2 River Labs-California Cannabis and Hemp Testing Analytical Lab is located to the northeast, and East Bay Tire Co. sits on the project site border to the east. There are single-family residential units located across the street from the project site boundary to the south. The project site is set back approximately 25-feet from the surrounding streets on the north, south, and west sides, and the driveway is located on the north side off of Harris Avenue.

The 2.38-acre project site consists of graded, vacant land, with a utility facility (SUMP 87) in the northeast corner right outside the parcel. SUMP 87 is owned and operated by the City and is not a part of the proposed project. Terrain in the immediate vicinity and within the project site is largely flat. There are four trees located within the project site; however, the project would require the removal of all existing trees. A utility line is located in the northeast corner of the project site and would require relocation.

SITE PLANNING AND ZONING DESIGNATION

The project site is located within the City's North Sacramento Community Plan Area. The plan area is bounded by the City limits to the north, the American River to the south, Natomas East Main Drainage Canal on the west, and Auburn Boulevard, Union Pacific Rail Line, and McClellan Business Park on the east. The North Sacramento Community Plan designates the project site as Employment Center (Low Rise). The City uses community plans to provide policy direction for various areas of the City based on conditions or issues unique to each community plan area. The community plan areas allow for more focused policy and direction within the City.

The project site is on two parcels with two APN's. Based on the City's Zoning Map Book, APN 250-0025-060 is zoned Light Industrial (M-1S), and APN 250-0025-005 is zoned Agriculture (A). APN 250-0025-005 is required to be rezoned from Agriculture to M-1S because Agriculture does not allow for truck and trailer repair maintenance.

PROJECT COMPONENTS

The proposed project is the development of a two-story repair facility with an administrative and office building, and three attached repair bays. Additionally, the project is proposing two concrete aprons, truck and trailer parking area, vehicle parking area, and landscaping around and within the project site. The project site is set back approximately 25-feet from the surrounding streets on the north, south, and west sides. The two-story repair facility is set back approximately 67-feet from the eastern boundary line. A more detailed description of individual project components is provided below.

Future Two-Story Repair Facility

The future two-story repair facility would consist of one administrative and office building with three attached repair bays. The total facility would be approximately 9,100-square feet (sf). The facility would be publicly accessed on the west side of the administrative and office building. Additional private entrances are located on the south and east sides of the repair bays. The two-story administrative and office building would be approximately 1,750-sf (70-ft x 25-ft). The first floor would consist of a reception area, eye-wash station, managers office, lockers, bench, two unisex bathrooms, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant shower, break room, and break room and customer's lounge. A parts storage would be located on the first floor next to the stairwell but is not assessable to the public. An 8-ft x 7-ft roll-up door would be located on the west side of the building. The second floor would be 1,750-sf and accessed from the stairwell in the parts storage. The second floor would consist of light storage of parts, reception area, two offices, dispatch area, unisex bathroom, and billing area. Total sf of the two-story administrative and office building would be 3,500-sf.

The three repair bays are attached to the administrative and office building and are each 1,400-sf (70-ft x 20-ft). Each repair bay would have 16-ft x 16-ft roll-up doors on the east and west ends. Total sf of all repair bays would be approximately 4,200-sf. Refer to Figure 3 in Appendix A for the proposed site plan.

Parking and Circulation

The project site would include one main 45-ft access driveway on the north side of the project site, off of Harris Avenue. The development would include a truck and trailer parking area and all vehicle parking area. The truck and trailer parking area would include 32 parking spaces, each with a 45-ft radius for rotation. The parking spaces would be split in half, with half placed 78-ft from the other half to allow for rotation and circulation. The truck and trailer parking area would be surrounded by a 6-ft-high CMU Block Fence (masonry wall) on the west and south sides. On the north side, the fencing would consist of a 6-ft-high masonry wall with wrought iron in every other section. A 6-foot-high chain link gate with privacy slates would allow for entrance and exit to the truck and trailer parking area on the east side.

The all-vehicle parking in the project site would include 25 spaces, with two being ADA compliant, and four being EVO compliant. The all-vehicle parking area would have labeled employee parking spaces versus visitor parking spaces. Employee parking would include 8 parking spaces. One parking space located adjacent to the entrance to the administrative and office building would be used for loading.

A sidewalk would be located adjacent to the main vehicle access driveway. This sidewalk would wrap around the northern, eastern, and western sides of the two-story repair facility, with access to the public entrance on the eastern side of the facility. There would be an ADA approved auto self-closing and auto locking gate at the entrance of the site from the sidewalk. Just outside the ADA approved gate, there would be 8 bicycle parking spaces. The project site would be paved to allow for on-site facilities and vehicles.

Fencing and Security

An 8-ft-high solid masonry wall, set back approximately 25-ft from the sidewalks, would be constructed along Opportunity Street and Morrison Avenue. A 6-ft-high wrought iron and masonry wall, set back approximately 25-feet from the sidewalk, would be constructed along Harris Avenue. The gate that allows for entrance/exit of the project site would remain open during operational hours.

Trash/ Recycling Enclosure

One covered trash enclosure would be provided on site, in the southeast corner off Morrison Avenue. All debris would be put into designated bins, labeled trash, or recycle. The local purveyor will keep a record of all debris to determine the percentage of recycled debris that is hauled from the product. In total, approximately 65 percent should be attainable.

Landscaping

The proposed landscaping would cover the estimated 25-ft set back areas as well as areas within the project site. Various shade trees would be provided with a 36-sf planter and would be planted along the vehicle parking spaces, the truck and trailer parking spaces, and surrounding the two-story repair facility. The total surfaced area would be approximately 23,054-sf, of which 50 percent is required by the City to be shaded. The landscaping plan would provide approximately 19,452-sf of shade in the parking lot, which equates to 84 percent of shading provided. Additionally, of the total 52,167 square feet of total vehicle parking area, approximately 26,848-sf, or 52 percent, of shade would be provided, which exceeds the minimum 50 perfect shade requirement. All planters in vehicle areas would be provided with 6-inch curbing to prevent traffic from rolling over plants and shrubs. Various ornamental and native shrubs, groundcover plants, and trees would be planted throughout the 25-ft set back. All planter areas would receive approximately 3-inches of layered bark mulch. The total projected water use is 1,134-gallons per day, and watering duration would occur either once or twice a week. There would be a total of 23,400-sf of landscaping in the project site. Refer to Figure 4 in Appendix A for the Landscaping Plan.

Utilities

The project would include two concrete aprons on the west and south sides of the two-story repair facility. The concrete apron on the west side would be 3,400-sf (40-ft x 85-ft) and the second concrete apron would be approximately 1,400-sf (20-ft x 70-ft). On the second concrete apron, there would be a 2,500-gallon oil collection tank with a traffic lid and accessible for pump out. On the three repair bays, the slab on the roof would slope down for drain collection.

Outdoor Amenities

A break area with table and benches would be placed along the eastern property line.

Appendices

Appendix A – Figures
Appendix B – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment
Appendix C – Biological Resources Evaluation Report
Appendix D – Cultural Resource Assessment
Appendix E – Noise and Vibration Assessment Letter Report
Appendix F- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

Entitlements

The project would require the following entitlements:

- Rezone
- Site Plan and Design Review
- Tree Removal Permit

SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Discussion

Land Use

The project site has been designated as Employment Center (Low Rise) in the 2035 General Plan, and is zoned M-1S, or Light-Industrial, in APN 250-0025-060 and zoned A, or Agriculture, in APN 250-0025-005. The City determined that a rezone is required of the portion of the parcel zoned A, and is to be rezoned as M-1S.

The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community. The project site is surrounded by similar light-industrial use developments and is located across the street from a single-family residential neighborhood. The proposed project is located in close proximity to Penske Truck Rental to the west, and Sacramento Truck Center to the north. Additionally, 2 River Labs- California Cannabis and Hemp Testing Analytical Lab is located to the northeast, and East Bay Tire Co. sits on the parcel border to the east. There are five single-family residential units that sit across the street from the project site to the south. Development of the site as proposed would alter the existing landscape, but the project site has been designated for urban development in the 2035 General Plan and the Planning and Development Code, and the proposed development is consistent with these planning designations.

Population and Housing

The 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) identifies, estimates, and evaluates population and housing changes caused by development of the 2035 General Plan, which have the potential to cause environmental effects (see MEIR, Chapter 4). The 2035 General Plan includes assumptions for the amount of growth that will occur within the Policy Area over the next 25 years. The General Plan assumes the City will grow by approximately 170,000 new residents, 86,000 new jobs, and 68,000 new housing units. The Population, Employment, and Housing analysis in the 2035 General Plan MEIR (Chapter 3) provides a detailed discussion of how the City reached these assumptions and the methodology used to determine a realistic level of growth for the City.

The proposed project would include the development of a two-story repair facility with an administrative and office building, and three attached repair bays. The repair facility would provide new job opportunities and temporary bring in truck drivers who need repairs. However, the proposed project would not construct new residences, nor would it induce substantial grown in the City that was not already envisioned in the 2035 General Plan. There are no occupied residences on the project site; therefore, neither occupied housing units nor people would be displaced by the proposed project, and replacement housing would not be required.

Agricultural Resources

The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development under the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.1. In addition to evaluating the effect of the general plan on sites within the City, the Master EIR noted that to the extent the 2035 General Plan accommodates future growth within the City limits, the conversion of farmland outside the City limits is minimized. The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

The project site does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance). (NRCS 2020). The California Important Farmland Finder map identified the site as "Urban and Built-Up Land" (CDC 2016) which is land used for a variety of developed purposes. One parcel on the project site is currently zoned A for agricultural uses but is requiring a rezone to M-1S by the City. There are no Williamson Act contracts that affect the project site. No *existing* agricultural or timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the project site. Development of the site would result in no impacts on agricultural resources.

Energy

Structures built as part of the project would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which serve to reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2035 General Plan includes Policies Utilities 6.1.9, 6.1.10-12, and 6.1.14 to encourage the use of energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers and recruiting businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

Policies 6.1.6 through 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would reduce the cumulative impacts associated with use of non-renewable energy sources. In addition, Policies 6.1.10 and 6.1.13 call for the City to work closely with utility providers and industries to promote new energy conservation technologies.

The MEIR evaluated the potential impacts on energy and concluded that the effects would be less than significant (see Impacts 4.11-6 and4.11-7). The proposed project would result in no new impacts not previously identified and evaluated in the MEIR.

Wildfire

The Master EIR does not identify any significant impacts related to wildfire risk. Per the CAL FIRE and Resources Assessment Program (FRAP), the City of Sacramento is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The City is not located within or adjacent to a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Furthermore, the project site is located within a developed area where a substantial wildland-urban interface does not exist. Thus, the risk of wildfire at the project site is minimal. Based on the above, the proposed project would not create a substantial risk for existing development in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts related to Wildfire.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
1. AESTHETICS Would the proposal: A) Create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance?			X
B) Create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses?			X
C) Substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located on two APN's: 250-0025-060 and 250-0025-005, and zoned A and M-1S respectively. The City determined that the parcel zoned A is be rezoned as M-1S because A does not allow for truck and trailer repair maintenance. The project site is surrounded by similar light-industrial use developments and is located across the street from a single-family residential neighborhood. The single-family residential units that sit across the street to the south are all considered potentially sensitive receptors. The project site is bounded by Harris Avenue to the north; existing light-industrial buildings to the east; Morrison Avenue to the south; and Opportunity Street to the west. The proposed project is located in close proximity to Penske Truck Rental to the west, and Sacramento Truck Center to the north. Additionally, 2 River Labs- California Cannabis and Hemp Testing Analytical Lab is located to the northeast, and East Bay Tire Co. sits on the parcel border to the east. The project site is currently vacant graded land with four designated trees and a utility line. All trees would be removed, and the utility line would be relocated for project construction. Streetlights are located off Morrison Avenue, Opportunity Street, and Harris Avenue.

Public views of the project site include views from motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling on Morrison Avenue along the southern side of the project, Opportunity Street from the western side, and on Harris Avenue along the northern side of the project site. Private views of the site would include those from single-family homes to south of the project site, and from those associated with the light-industrial developments in the surrounding area. Given that the project site is currently vacant, sources of light and glare do not exist on the site.

The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the State Scenic Highway System which provides guidance and assists local government agencies with the process to officially designate scenic highways. According to Caltrans, there are no designated scenic highways located in proximity to the project site. Given the vacant and disturbed nature of the site, the project site does not contain scenic resources. It is also not located in an area designated as a scenic resource or a vista and is not visible from any State Scenic Highways (Caltrans 2018).

The City of Sacramento is generally built out; however, new development associated with the 2035 General Plan could result in changes to important scenic resources as seen from visually sensitive locations. Important scenic resources in the City of Sacramento include major natural open space features such as the American River and Sacramento River, including associated parkways. Another important scenic resource is the State Capitol (as defined by the Capitol View Protection Ordinance). Other potential

important scenic resources include important historic structures listed on the Sacramento Register of Historic and Cultural Resources, California and/or National Registers.

Visually sensitive public locations include viewpoints where a change to the visibility of an important scenic resource, or a visual change to the resource itself, would affect the general public. Visually sensitive public locations include public plazas, trails, parks, parkways, or designated publicly available and important scenic corridors (e.g., Capitol View Protection Corridor). The project site does not contain scenic resources and is not located in an area designated as a scenic resource or vista.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to aesthetics are based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact related to aesthetics would occur if the project would:

- substantially interfere with an important scenic resource or substantially degrade the view of an existing scenic resource; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare that is substantially greater than typical urban sources and could cause sustained annoyance or hazard for nearby sensitive receptors.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the general plan City of Sacramento, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2035 General Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.13, Visual Resources.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for light and glare (Impact 4.13-1) and concluded that impacts would be less than significant.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Questions A and B

According to the Master EIR, the City of Sacramento is mostly built out and a large amount of widespread, ambient light from urban uses already exists. New development permitted under the 2035 General Plan would add sources of light that are similar to the existing urban light sources from any of the following: exterior building lighting, parking lot lights, security lighting, and headlights from vehicular traffic. Security lighting would follow City of Sacramento standards and be designed to avoid spill-over illumination to adjacent streets and properties. Sensitive land uses would generally be residential uses, especially single- and multi-family residential uses. As such, the single-family development located to the south of the project site would be considered sensitive receptors to project-generated light and glare. Potential new sources of light associated with the development and operation of the proposed project would be similar to the adjacent light industrial uses to the north, west, and east of the project site. Streetlights off of Morrison Avenue, Opportunity Street, and Harris Avenue are existing.

The proposed project site would develop a two-story repair facility and a truck and trailer parking area on vacant, graded land, adding new sources of light and glare that could affect the surrounding areas. However, the proposed project would be required to adhere to the City's lighting standards and Policy LU 6.1.12 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses) that ensure that the introduction of higher density mixed-use development along major arterial corridors is compatible with adjacent land uses by requiring specific design features. Policy ER 7.1.3 specifically addresses lighting spill-over. Both policies require outdoor lighting to be shielded and cast downward to reduce light spillover on adjacent properties and glare from the area. The two-story repair facility would not use reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface (and on the ground three floors), mirrored glass, black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface

of a building, or metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building. Although the project site borders a single-family residential neighborhood, the existing light-industrial developments in the vicinity are similar and consistent to the proposed project. Refer to Figure 5 and Figure 6 in Appendix A for visual renderings of two-story repair facility.

Based on the above, while the proposed project has the potential to introduce new sources of light from security lighting, exterior building lighting, parking lot lights, and the headlights of trucks entering or exiting the project site, the type and intensity of light and glare would be similar to that of the surrounding industrial developments and would be consistent with what has been anticipated for the site for the 2035 General Plan and analyzed in the Master EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** to related to sources or light and glare.

Question C

The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of any significant visual resources such as the American River, Sacramento River, State Capitol, or any public trails. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to changing the visual character of such resources.

The project is located in an area developed primarily with light-industrial to the north, east, and west, and a single-family residential neighborhood to the south. State Route 80 is located just north of the project site. The project site is completely vacant and graded and the proposed building would be at a similar elevation to the existing light industrial in the project vicinity. The 2035 General Plan identifies land use of the project site and the parcels bordering it to the north, east, and west as employment center low-rise. The land use of the parcel to the south is designated as rural neighborhood. The proposed project would be compatible with the existing light-industrial land uses surrounding the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the degradation of the visual character of the site and the surrounding areas.

The proposed development would change the appearance of the site as viewed from nearby areas but would have similar bulk and scale to the light industrial uses to the north, east, and west. The two-story repair center would be 30 feet at its highest point and consist of grey, brown, white, red, and light stone exterior walls. No contrasting architectural features or visual elements are proposed, and the project would be visually compatible with surrounding development. As part of the project review and presentation to the decision makers, site plan and design review was conducted by staff of the proposed project for presentation of a recommendation to Planning and Design Commission and ultimately City Council. As noted in Chapter 17.808 of the Sacramento City Code, the purpose of Site Plan and Design Review is to ensure that the physical aspects of development projects are consistent with the General Plan and any other applicable specific plans or design guidelines, that projects are high quality and compatible with surrounding development, among other considerations. Accordingly, Site Plan and Design Review for the proposed project would ensure that the proposed development would not result in substantial degradation in the existing visual character of the project site.

Therefore, potential impacts to the visual character of the site and its surroundings associated with the development of the site with light industrial uses have been previously analyzed in the Master EIR, and the proposed project would **have *no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what was anticipated for the site in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
2. AIR QUALITY *Would the proposal:* A) Result in construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day?			X
B) Result in operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day?			X
C) Violate any air quality standard or have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X
D) Result in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations that exceed SAMQMD requirements?			X
E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)?			X
F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
G) Result in TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources?			X
H) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X

This section evaluates potential air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project. This analysis is based on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment letter (HELIX 2021) prepared for the project, which is included as Appendix B to this Initial Study.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB consists of all or parts of eleven counties spanning from Solano and Sacramento counties to the south, and Shasta County to the north. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws for Sacramento County, including the project area.

The climate of the SVAB is characterized by hot dry summers and mild rainy winters. During the year the temperature may range from 20 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs usually in the 90s and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches with snowfall being very rare. The prevailing winds are moderate in strength and vary from moist breezes from the south to dry land flows from the north. The mountains surrounding the Sacramento Valley create a barrier to airflow, which can trap air pollutants in the valley when certain meteorological conditions are right, and a temperature inversion (areas of warm air overlying areas of cooler air) exists. Air stagnation in the autumn and early winter occurs when large high-pressure cells lie over the valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduces the influx of outside air and allows pollutants to become concentrated in the air. The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with increased levels of smoke or when temperature inversions trap cool air, fog, and pollutants near the ground. The ozone season (May through October) in the SVAB is characterized by stagnant morning air or light winds with the breeze arriving in the afternoon out of the southwest from the San Francisco Bay. Usually, the evening breeze transports the airborne pollutants to the north out of the SVAB. During about half of the days from July to September, however, a phenomenon called the "Schultz Eddy" prevents this from occurring. Instead of allowing for the prevailing wind patterns to move north carrying the pollutants out of the valley, the Schultz Eddy causes the wind pattern and pollutants to circle back southward. This phenomenon's effect exacerbates the pollution levels in the area and increases the likelihood of violating the federal and state air quality standards (SMAQMD 2021).

Criteria Air Pollutants

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970, as amended in 1990, has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for several air pollution constituents known as criteria pollutants, including: ozone (O_3); carbon monoxide (CO); coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}; particles 10 microns or less) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$; particles 2.5 microns or less); sulfur dioxide (SO_2); and lead (Pb). As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted the more stringent California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents. Ground-level ozone is not emitted directly into the environment but is generated from complex chemical and photochemical reactions between precursor pollutants, primarily reactive organic gases (ROGs; also known as volatile organic compounds [VOC]), [a] and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X). PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are generated from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations and windblown dust. In addition, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ can also be formed through chemical and photochemical reactions of precursor pollutants in the atmosphere.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for the ambient air quality standards. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once. An "unclassified" designation indicates that insufficient data was available to determine the status. The air quality attainment status of Sacramento County is shown in Table 1, *Sacramento County Attainment Status*.

[a] CARB defines and uses the term ROGs while the USEPA defines and uses the term VOCs. The compounds included in the lists of ROGs and VOCs and the methods of calculation are slightly different. However, for the purposes of estimating criteria pollutant precursor emissions, the two terms are often used interchangeably.

Table 1
Sacramento County Attainment Status

Pollutant	State of California Attainment Status	Federal Attainment Status
Ozone (1 hour)	Nonattainment	No Federal Standard
Ozone (8 hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Attainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide ($N0_2$)	Attainment	Attainment
Lead	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Source: SMAQMD 2021.

Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM_{10} standards, and the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standards. The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in Sacramento County. Attainment plans for meeting the federal air quality standards are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which is subsequently submitted to the USEPA, the federal agency that administrates the Federal CAA of 1970, as amended in 1990. The current air quality plan applicable to the project, the *Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Regional Ozone Plan), was developed by the SMAQMD and adjacent air district to describe how the air districts in and near the Sacramento metropolitan area will continue the progress toward attaining state and national ozone air quality standards (SMAQMD 2017).

Existing Air Quality

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been charged with implementing national air quality programs. EPA's air quality mandates are drawn primarily from the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), which was enacted in 1970 and most recently amended by Congress in 1990. The CAA required EPA to establish the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the following criteria air pollutants: ozone, CO, NO_2, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and lead. CAA also requires each State to prepare a State implementation plan (SIP) for attaining and maintaining the NAAQS. The federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) added requirements for states with nonattainment areas to revise their SIPs to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. Individual SIPs are modified periodically to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins as reported by their jurisdictional agencies.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of State and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CCAA, which was adopted in 1988, required CARB to establish its own California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). CARB has established CAAQS for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, visibility-reducing particulate matter, and the above-mentioned criteria air pollutants. In most cases the CAAQS are more stringent than the NAAQS.

The SVAB is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS 8-hour ozone standard and the CAAQS for both 1-hour and 8-hour O_3 standard. The SVAB is also currently designated as nonattainment for both NAAQS and CAAQS 24-hour PM_{10} standards. In addition, the SVAB is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard. The air basin is designated as unclassified or in attainment for the remaining criteria air pollutants (SMAQMD 2019).

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a diverse group of air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs can cause long-term chronic health effects such as cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, asthma, bronchitis, or genetic damage, or short-term acute effects such as eye watering, respiratory irritation (a cough), runny nose, throat pain, and headaches. TACs are considered either carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic based on the nature of the health effects associated with exposure to the pollutant. For carcinogenic TACs, there is no level of exposure that is considered safe, and impacts are evaluated in terms of overall relative risk expressed as excess cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. Noncarcinogenic TACs differ in that there is generally assumed to be a safe level of exposure below which no negative health impact is believed to occur. These levels are determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

The Health and Safety Code (§39655[a]) defines TAC as "an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health." All substances that are listed as hazardous air pollutants pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the CAA (42 United States Code Sec. 7412[b]) are designated as TACs. Under State law, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), acting through CARB, is authorized to identify a substance as a TAC if it determines the substance is an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is referred to as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is 10 microns or less in diameter, and 90 percent of DPM is less than 2.5 microns in diameter (CARB 2021a). Because of their extremely small size, these particles can be inhaled and eventually trapped in the bronchial and alveolar regions of the lung. In 1998, CARB identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM has a notable effect on California's population—it is estimated that about 70 percent of total known cancer risk related to air toxics in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2021a).

Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others due to the types of population groups or activities involved and are referred to as sensitive receptors. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) have identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, infants (including in utero in the third trimester of pregnancy), and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis (CARB 2005; OEHHA 2015).

Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Children and infants are considered more susceptible to health effects of air pollution due to their immature immune systems, developing organs, and higher breathing rates. As such, schools are also considered sensitive receptors, as children are present for extended durations and engage in regular outdoor activities.

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences across Morrison Drive south of the project site, approximately 80 feet from the project parking lot and approximately 150 feet from the project building. The closest school (kindergarten up to 12th grade) to the project site is the Glenwood Elementary School approximately 2,100 feet (0.4 miles) to the north. The closest daycare center to the school is the Morey Avenue Early Childhood Development Center, approximately 600 feet south of the project site.

Greenhouse Gases

Global climate change refers to changes in average climatic conditions on Earth including temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Global temperatures are moderated by atmospheric gases. These gases are commonly referred to as greenhouse gasses (GHGs) because they function like a greenhouse by letting sunlight in but preventing heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere.

GHGs are emitted by natural processes and human (anthropogenic) activities. Anthropogenic GHG emissions are primarily associated with: burning of fossil fuels during motorized transport; electricity generation; natural gas consumption; industrial activity; manufacturing; and other activities such as deforestation, agricultural activity, and solid waste decomposition.

The GHGs defined under California's Assembly Bill (AB) 32, described below, include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Each GHG differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere based on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Estimates of GHG emissions are commonly presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential (GWP). Expressing GHG emissions in CO_2e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO_2 were being emitted. GHG emissions quantities in this analysis are presented in metric tons (MT) of CO_2e. For consistency with United Nations Standards, modeling and reporting of GHGs in California and the U.S. use the GWPs defined in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007): CO_2 – 1; CH_4 – 25; N_2O – 298.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Regulations and Plans

The primary GHG reduction regulatory legislation and plans (applicable to the project) at the State, regional, and local levels are described below. Implementation of California's GHG reduction mandates is primarily under the authority of CARB at the state level, SMAQMD and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) at the regional level, and the City at the local level.

Executive Order S-3-05: On June 1, 2005, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 proclaimed that California is vulnerable to climate change impacts. It declared that increased temperatures could reduce snowpack in the Sierra Nevada, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To avoid or reduce climate change impacts, EO S-3-05 calls for a reduction in GHG emissions to the year 2000 level by 2010, to year 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Executive Orders are not laws and can only provide the governor's direction to state agencies to act within their authority to reinforce existing laws.

Assembly Bill 32 – Global Warming Solution Act of 2006: The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, widely known as AB 32, requires that CARB develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. CARB is directed by AB 32 to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The bill requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions.

Executive Order B-30-15: On April 29, 2015, EO B-30-15 established a California GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The EO aligns California's GHG emission reduction targets with those of leading international governments, including the 28 nation European Union. California is on track to meet or exceed the target of reducing GHGs emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. California's new emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the goal established by EO S-3-05 of reducing emissions 80 percent under 1990 levels by 2050.

Senate Bill 32: Signed into law by Governor Brown on September 8, 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 (Amendments to the California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006) extends California's GHG reduction programs beyond 2020. SB 32 amended the Health and Safety Code to include Section 38566,

which contains language to authorize CARB to achieve a statewide GHG emission reduction of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by no later than December 31, 2030. SB 32 codified the targets established by EO B-30-15 for 2030, which set the next interim step in the State's continuing efforts to pursue the long-term target expressed in EO B-30-15 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2050.

California Air Resources Board: On December 11, 2008, the CARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) as directed by AB 32. The Scoping Plan proposes a set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California to the levels required by AB 32. Measures applicable to development projects include those related to energy-efficiency building and appliance standards, the use of renewable sources for electricity generation, regional transportation targets, and green building strategy. Relative to transportation, the Scoping Plan includes nine measures or recommended actions related to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle GHGs through fuel and efficiency measures. These measures would be implemented statewide rather than on a project-by-project basis (CARB 2008).
In response to EO B-30-15 and SB 32, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions were directed to implement measures to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 targets. The mid-term target is critical to help frame the suite of policy measures, regulations, planning efforts, and investments in clean technologies and infrastructure needed to continue driving down emissions (CARB 2014). In December 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target, to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32 (CARB 2017).

Sacramento Area Council of Governments: As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), SACOG has developed the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT.

City of Sacramento: To meet the statewide GHG emission targets, the City adopted the City of Sacramento Climate Action Plan (CAP) on February 14, 2012 to comply with AB 32. The CAP identified how the City and the broader community could reduce Sacramento's GHG emissions and included reduction targets, strategies, and specific actions. In 2015, the City of Sacramento adopted the 2035 General Plan Update. The update incorporated measures and actions from the CAP into Appendix B, General Plan CAP Policies and Programs, which includes citywide policies and programs that are supportive of reducing GHG emissions.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of 2035 General Plan policies:

- Construction emissions of NOx above 85 pounds per day;
- Operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Any increase in PM_{10} concentrations, unless all feasible Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and Best Management Practices (BMP) have been applied, then increases above 80 pounds per day or 14.6 tons per year;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour State ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm); or,

- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

A project would be considered to have a significant effect relating to greenhouse gas emissions if it conflicts with the City's 2035 General Plan policies and programs supporting the City's GHG reduction targets, and if the project would result in construction or operational GHG emissions exceeding the SMAQMD's threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.2.

Policies in the 2035 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.2 requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure that the projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.4 and ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the 2035 General Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include ER 6.1.4, requiring coordination with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs, and impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety; as well as Policy LU 2.7.5 requiring extensive landscaping and trees along freeways fronting elevation and design elements that provide proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions from buildings.

The Master EIR found that greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2035 General Plan would contribute to climate change on a cumulative basis. Policies of the General Plan identified in the Master EIR that would reduce construction related GHG emissions include: ER 6.1.2, ER 6.1.11 requiring coordination with SMAQMD to ensure feasible mitigation measures are incorporated to reduce GHG emissions, and ER 6.1.15. The 2035 General Plan incorporates the GHG reduction strategy of the 2012 Climate Action Plan (CAP), which demonstrates compliance mechanism for achieving the City's adopted GHG reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 emissions by 2020. Policy ER 6.1.8 commits the City to assess and monitor performance of GHG emission reduction efforts beyond 2020, and progress toward meeting long-term GHG emission reduction goals, ER 6.1.9 also commits the City to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of new GHG emissions reduction measures in view of the City's longer-term GHG emission reductions goal. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150).

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2035 General Plan that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 4.14, and pages 4.14-1 et seq. The Master EIR is available for review online at
http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be **less than significant**, and no mitigation would be required (City 2014; City 2015b).

Construction emissions of NO_X during project construction would primarily result from the use of heavy diesel-powered off-road equipment and from vehicles (primarily diesel-powered trucks) traveling to and from the project site. Project construction emissions were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0, as described in the AQ/GHG assessment letter (see Appendix B). Maximum daily emissions of NO_X are predicted to occur during site preparations and would be 11.0 pounds per day. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in emissions of NO_X in excess of 85 pounds per day and would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question B

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable; no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact (City 2014; City 2015b).

Emission sources of NO_X and ROG from long-term operation of the project would be exhaust from vehicles, exhaust from the occasional use of landscape maintenance equipment, and occasional ROG emissions from the use of solvents and degreasers and the reapplication of paint for building and parking lot maintenance.

Project operational emissions were modeled using CalEEMod, as described in the AQ/GHG assessment letter (see Appendix B). The results of the modeling show that operation of the project would produce a maximum of 0.7 pounds per day of NO_X and 0.3 pounds per day of ROG. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in emissions of NO_X or ROG in excess of 65 pounds per day and would ***have no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question C

The General Plan Master EIR evaluated impacts related to emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_X) and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) and found impacts to be to be significant and unavoidable; no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact. The General Plan Master EIR did not evaluate impacts related to the cumulative contribution of emissions (City 2014; City 2015b).

The pollutants of primary concern in Sacramento County are those related to the NAAQS and CAAQS nonattainment designations discussed above: NO_X and ROG (because they are ozone precursors), PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. As discussed in questions A and B, above, and question D, below, construction and operation of the project would not result in emissions in excess of the SMAQMD thresholds which were developed to ensure that a development project's contribution to regional air quality would not result in a new air quality standard violation or result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing air quality violation. Therefore, the project would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question D

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (City 2014; City 2015b).

The project would result in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during construction in the form of fugitive dust from earth moving and disturbing activities and in the form exhaust emissions, primarily from diesel powered off-road equipment and on-road trucks. According to the SMAQMD's CEQA Guide Thresholds, projects that result in less than 80 pounds per day of PM_{10} and less than 82 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$ during construction

would have less than significant impacts. However, all construction projects, regardless of the emission levels, are required to implement the SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (also known as BMPs; SMAQMD 2019). The BMPs satisfy the requirements of SMAQMD's Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, which requires every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates (SMAQMD 1977). The results of the modeling show that construction of the project would produce a maximum of 3.2 pounds per day of PM_{10} and 1.8 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$.

The project would result in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during operation in the form of fugitive dust, brake dust, and vehicle exhaust from vehicles traveling to and from the project site. The results of the modeling show that operation of the project would produce less than 0.1 pounds per day of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.

Therefore, construction or operation of the project would not result in emissions of PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ in excess of the SMAQMD thresholds and would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question E

The General Plan Master EIR did not evaluate impacts from CO concentrations (City 2014; City 2015b).
As described in the existing air quality discussion, above, Sacramento County is designated in attainment for the CO NAAQS and CAAQS. According to the SMAQMD's CEQA Guide (SMAQMD 2021): "Other pollutants such as CO, sulfur dioxide and lead are of less concern because operational activities are not likely to generate substantial quantities of these criteria air pollutants and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin has been in attainment for these criteria air pollutants for multiple years." Localized concentrations of CO, or "hot spots," are primarily of concern for heavily congested roadways with stop-ang-go traffic, particularly in areas with limited vertical mixing such as tunnels, long underpasses, or below-grade roadways. Because the project's contribution to area traffic would be limited a maximum of 32 trucks and cars per day, the project would not result in CO localized concentrations that exceed the CAAQS. The impact would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question F

The General Plan Master EIR evaluated impact to sensitive receptors resulting from exposure to substantial concentrations of TACs and found the impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. The General Plan Master EIR evaluated impacts related to emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_X) and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) and found impacts to be to be significant and unavoidable; no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact. The General Plan Master EIR did not evaluate impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of other criteria pollutants (City 2014; City 2015b).

As described above, the closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences across Morrison Drive south of the project site, approximately 80 feet from the project parking lot and approximately 150 feet from the project building. As discussed in question E above, and question G, below, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations and the project would have ***no additional project-specific environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question G

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (City 2014; City 2015b).

The project would add a maximum of 20 daily truck trips (16 client truck trips and 4 vendor truck trips) to area roads and would not contribute substantially to increased health risks from exposure to TACs from mobile sources.

The only significant source of TACs on the project site would be DPM from off-road equipment during construction and from trucks idling and circulating on the project site during long-term operation. Due to the small size of the project, short duration of construction, and intermittent nature of constructions activities, construction of the project would not result in substantially increased health risks due to prolonged exposure to concentrations of DPM. A health risk assessment was conducted to determine the long-term community health risks associated with exposure to DPM from operation of the project, as described in the AQ/GHG assessment letter (see Appendix B).

Health risks associated with cancer from development projects are estimated using the incremental excess cancer risk expressed as cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. The incremental excess cancer risk is an estimate of the chance a person exposed to specific sources of a TACs may have of developing cancer from that exposure beyond the individual's risk of developing cancer from existing background levels of pollutants in the ambient air. For context, the average cancer risk from TACs in the ambient air for an individual living in an urban area of California is 830 in 1 million (CARB 2015). Cancer risk estimates do not mean, and should not be interpreted to mean, that a person will develop cancer from estimated exposures to toxic air pollutants.

Health risks associated with chronic and acute effects from a development project are quantified using the maximum hazard index. A hazard index is the potential exposure to a substance divided by the reference exposure level (the level at which no adverse effects are expected). A hazard index of less than one indicates no adverse health effects are expected from the potential exposure to the substance. The maximum hazard index is the sum of hazard indices for pollutants with non-cancer health effects that have the same or similar adverse health effects.

The modeled point of maximum impact for the project (geographic point outside of the project site with the highest estimated incremental cancer risk and maximum hazard index) would be a point near the project boundary in the Harris Drive right of way, approximately 36 feet north of the project building, at approximately Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates Zone 10, 633600 meters east, 4277800 meters north. The maximum health risk exposure at this point would be a residential incremental cancer risk of 0.7 in 1 million and a residential non-cancer chronic hazard index less than 0.01. No residents or workers are anticipated to be at the point of maximum impact for prolonged periods. The cancer risk isopleths (contours of equal risk) are shown in Figure 4 of Appendix B.

The maximum estimated community incremental excess cancer, chronic and acute health risks due to exposure to the project TAC emissions from long term operation of the project are presented in Table 2, *Maximum Exposed Individual Incremental Cancer Health Risk and Hazard Index*. These estimates are conservative (health protective) and assume that the resident or worker is outdoors for the entire 30-year exposure period.

Table 2
Maximum Exposed Individual Incremental Cancer Risk and Hazard Index

	MEI Resident Cancer Risk	**MEI Worker Cancer Risk**	**MEI Resident Chronic Hazard Index**	**MEI Worker Chronic Hazard Index**
Results	0.2 in 1 million	<0.1 in 1 million	<0.01	<0.01
Threshold	10 in 1 million	10 in 1 million	1	1
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Source: HELIX 2021 (see Appendix B).
MEI = Maximum Exposed Individual

As shown in Table 2, the maximum incremental increased cancer risks, and maximum non-cancer chronic and acute hazard index due to exposure to DPM from long term operation of the project would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in TAC exposures creating an increased cancer risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase health risks from exposure to TACs from mobile sources, and the project would have ***no additional significant environmental***

effects beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question H

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (City 2014; City 2015b).

To meet the statewide GHG emission targets, the City adopted the City of Sacramento Climate Action Plan (CAP) on February 14, 2012 to comply with AB 32. The CAP identified how the City and the broader community could reduce Sacramento's GHG emissions and included reduction targets, strategies, and specific actions. In 2015, the City of Sacramento adopted the 2035 General Plan Update. The update incorporated measures and actions from the CAP. Appendix B, General Plan CAP Policies and Programs, lists the citywide policies and programs that are supportive of reducing GHG emissions.

The project site is designated as Employment Center (Low Rise) in the North Sacramento Community Plan. The project would be consistent with the land use designation and would not require a General Plan or Community Plan Amendment. Therefore, the employment growth resulting from implementation of the project would be consistent with the assumptions used to calculate future City and community GHG inventories, and GHG emissions reduction goals. The project would maintain existing sidewalks along the project frontage of Harris Avenue, Opportunity Street, and Morrison Avenue. The project would comply with the City development standards and regulations for the project driveways and sidewalks, which address hazards or barriers for pedestrian or bicycle access, and bicycle parking requirements. The project building would comply with current Title 24 building energy standards. The project would comply with City and current CALGreen building water efficiency and water efficient landscaping and irrigation requirements. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any of the policies or programs identified in the 2035 General Plan Appendix B for supporting the City's GHG reduction goals.

The SMAQMD has provided guidance which lead agencies can use to determine the significance of the GHG emissions associated with individual development projects. Projects which result in construction or operational GHG emissions less than 1,100 MT CO_2e per year would not result in a significant GHG emission impact (SMAQMD 2021). The project's construction and operational GHG emissions were quantified using CalEEMod as described in the AQ/GHG assessment letter (see Appendix B) and are compared to the SMAQMDs GHG threshold in Table 3, *Construction and Operational GHG Emissions*.

Table 3
Construction and Operational GHG Emissions

Source	Annual Emissions (MT CO_2e per year)
Construction (2022)	63
Operation (2023)	95
SMAQMD Threshold	1,100
Exceed Threshold?	No

Source: HELIX 2021 (see Appendix B).
MTCO2e = Metric tons carbon dioxide equivalents; SMAQMD = Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

As discussed above, the project would not conflict with, or obstruction implementation of, any policies or programs identified in the City's 2035 General Plan as supporting attainment of the City's GHG reduction goals. As shown in Table 2, the project's construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed the SMAQMD's threshold. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan, policy, or regulation and the project would ***have no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None Required

FINDINGS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Prior to human development, the natural habitats within the region included perennial grasslands, riparian woodlands, oak woodlands, and a variety of wetlands including vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, freshwater marshes, ponds, streams, and rivers. Over the last 150 years, agriculture, irrigation, flood control, and urbanization have resulted in the loss or alteration of much of the natural habitat within the City limits. Non-native annual grasses have replaced the native perennial grasslands, many of the natural streams have been channelized, much of the riparian and oak woodlands have been cleared, and most of the marshes have been drained and converted to agricultural or urban uses.

Though the majority of the City is developed with residential, commercial, and other urban development, valuable plant and wildlife habitat still exists. These natural habitats are located primarily outside the city boundaries in the northern, southern and eastern portions of the City, but also occur along river and stream corridors and on a number of undeveloped parcels. Habitats that are present in the City include annual grasslands, riparian woodlands, oak woodlands, riverine, ponds, freshwater marshes, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools. The analysis of biological resources on and within the vicinity of the project site is presented in Appendix C, Biological Resources Evaluation Report.

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

State and Federal Endangered Species Acts

Special status species are protected by state and federal laws. The California Endangered Species Act (CESA; California Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2097) protects species listed as threatened and endangered under CESA from harm or harassment. This law is similar to the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA; 16 USC 1531 et seq.) which protects federally threatened or endangered species (50 CFR 17.11, and 17.12; listed species) from take. For both laws, take of the protected species may be allowed through consultation with and issuance of a permit by the agency with jurisdiction over the protected species.

California Code of Regulations Title 14 and California Fish and Game Code

The official listing of endangered and threatened animals and plants is contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 14 §670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to include in the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code.

Legal protection is also provided for wildlife species in California that are identified as "fully protected animals." These species are protected under Sections 3511 (birds), 4700 (mammals), 5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and 5515 (fish) of the California Fish and Game Code. These statutes prohibit take or possession of fully protected species at any time. CDFW is unable to authorize incidental take of fully protected species unless any such take authorization is issued in conjunction with the approval of a Natural Community Conservation Plan that covers the fully protected species (California Fish and Game Code Section 2835).

California Native Plant Protection Act

The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900-1913) empowers the Fish and Game Commission to list native plant species, subspecies, or varieties as endangered or rare following a public hearing. To the extent that the location of such plants is known, CDFW must notify property owners that a listed plant is known to occur on their property. Where a property owner has been so notified by CDFW, the owner must notify CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use (other than changing from one agricultural use to another), in order that CDFW may salvage listed plants that would otherwise be destroyed. Currently, 64 taxa of native plants have been listed as rare under the act.

Nesting and Migratory Birds

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species "fully protected" (including all raptors), making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USF §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or death, and project-related disturbance must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit (with jurisdiction over California) has ruled that the MBTA does not prohibit incidental take (952 F 2d 297 – Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit 1991).

City of Sacramento Tree Protection Ordinance

The City of Sacramento protects trees under Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. A permit is required to remove native oaks (*Quercus* spp.), buckeyes (*Aesculus californicus*), or sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*) having a diameter at standard height (DSH, i.e., 54 inches above grade) of 12 inches or more, or any tree having a DSH of 24 inches or more, on undeveloped private parcels inside the City limits. For a tree with a common root system that branches at the ground, DSH means the sum of the diameter of the largest trunk and one-half the cumulative diameter of the remaining trunks at 4.5 feet above natural grade.

Jurisdictional Waters

<u>Federal Requirements</u>

Any person, firm, or agency planning to alter or work in "waters of the U.S.," (WOTUS) including the discharge of dredged or fill material, must first obtain authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA; 33 USC 1344). Permits, licenses, variances, or similar authorization may also be required by other federal, state, and local statutes. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act prohibits the obstruction or alteration of navigable WOTUS without a permit from USACE (33 USC 403).

On April 21, 2020, the USEPA and USACE published the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) to define "Waters of the United States" in the Federal Register. On June 22, 2020, the NWPR: Definition of "Waters of the United States" became effective in 49 states, including California, and in all US territories.

The NWPR regulates traditional navigable waters and perennial or intermittent tributary systems, and defines four categories of regulated waters including:

- The territorial seas and traditional navigable waters;
- Perennial and intermittent tributaries to those waters;
- Certain lakes, ponds, and impoundments; and,
- Wetlands adjacent to jurisdictional waters.

The NWPR also defines 12 categories of exempted aquatic resources:

1. Waters not listed as WOTUS
2. Groundwater
3. Ephemeral features
4. Diffuse stormwater run-off
5. Ditches not identified as WOTUS
6. Prior converted cropland
7. Artificially irrigated areas
8. Artificial lakes and ponds
9. Water-filled depressions incidental to mining or construction activity
10. Stormwater control features
11. Groundwater recharge, water reuse, and wastewater recycling structures
12. Waste treatment systems

With non-tidal waters, in the absence of adjacent wetlands, the extent of USACE jurisdiction extends to the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) – the line on the shore established by fluctuations of water and indicated by a clear, natural line impressed on the bank, shelving, changes in soil character, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, or the presence of litter and debris. Wetlands are defined in 33 CFR Part 328 as:

> "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions."

Federal and state regulations pertaining to WOTUS, including wetlands, are discussed below.

Clean Water Act (CWA; 33 USC 1251-1376). The CWA provides guidance for the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters.

Section 401 requires that an applicant for a federal license or permit that allows activities resulting in a discharge to WOTUS must obtain a state certification that the discharge complies with other provisions of CWA. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) administers the certification program in California and may require State Water Quality Certification before other permits are issued.

Section 402 establishes a permitting system for the discharge of any pollutant (except dredged or fill material) into WOTUS. This system is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, administered by the USEPA, that has granted oversight authority in California to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through its RWQCBs.

Section 404 establishes a permit program administered by USACE that regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into WOTUS (including wetlands). Implementing regulations by USACE are found at 33 CFR Parts 320-332. The Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines were developed by the USEPA in conjunction with USACE (40 CFR Part 230), allowing the discharge of dredged or fill material for non-water dependent uses into special aquatic sites only if there is no practicable alternative that would have less adverse impacts.

State Requirements

Waters of the State

Any action requiring a CWA Section 404 permit, or a Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 permit, must also obtain a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification. The State of California Water Quality Certification (WQC) Program was formally initiated by the SWRCB in 1990 under the requirements stipulated by Section 401 of the Federal CWA. Although the CWA is a Federal law, Section 401 of the CWA recognizes that states have the primary authority and responsibility for setting water quality standards. In California, under Section 401, the State and Regional Water Boards are the authorities that certify that issuance of a federal license or permit does not violate California's water quality standards (i.e., that they do not violate Porter-Cologne and the Water Code). The WQC Program currently issues the WQC for discharges requiring USACE permits for fill and dredge discharges within WOTUS, and now also implements the State's wetland protection and hydromodification regulation program under the Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

On April 2, 2019, the SWRCB adopted a State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State (Procedures), for inclusion in the forthcoming Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries and Ocean Waters of California. The Procedures consist of four major elements: (1) a wetland definition; (2) a framework for determining if a feature that meets the wetland definition is a water of the state; (3) wetland delineation procedures; and (4) procedures for the submittal, review, and approval of applications for Water Quality Certifications and Waste Discharge Requirements for dredge or fill activities. The Office of Administrative Law approved the Procedures on August 28, 2019, and the Procedures become effective May 28, 2020. The SWRCB circulated final implementation Guidance on the Procedures in April 2020.

Under the Procedures and the State Water Code (Water Code §13050(e)), "Waters of the State" are defined as "any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state." Unless excluded by the Procedures, any activity that could result in discharge of dredged or fill material to Waters of the State, which includes Waters of the U.S. and non-federal Waters of the State, requires filing of an application under the Procedures.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne Act, Water Code Section 13000 et seq.) is California's statutory authority for the protection of water quality in conjunction with the federal CWA. The Porter-Cologne Act requires the SWRCB and RWQCBs under the CWA to adopt and periodically update water quality control plans, or basin plans. Basin plans are plans in which beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and implementation programs are established for each of the nine regions in California. The Porter-Cologne Act also requires dischargers of pollutants or dredged or fill material to notify the RWQCBs of such activities by filing Reports of Waste Discharge and authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCBs to issue and enforce waste discharge requirements, NPDES permits, Section 401 water quality certifications, or other approvals. Projects that do not require a federal permit may still require review and approval by the RWQCB. The RWQCB focuses on ensuring that projects do not adversely affect the "beneficial uses" associated with waters of the State. In most cases, the RWQCB requires the integration of water quality control measures into projects that will require discharge into waters of the State. For most construction projects, the RWQCB requires the use of construction and post-construction BMPs.

California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 – Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

Diversions or obstructions of the natural flow of, or substantial changes or use of material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake in California that supports wildlife resources are subject to regulation by CDFW, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. The CDFW requires notification prior to commencement of any such activities, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 1601 1603, if the activity may substantially adversely affect an existing fish and wildlife resource.

Methods

Studies conducted in support of this report included a special-status species evaluation, and a biological reconnaissance survey, which included a tree inventory.

Special-Status Species Evaluation

For the purposes of this report, special-status species are those that fall into one or more of the following categories, including those:

- listed as endangered or threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA; including candidates and species proposed for listing);
- listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA; including candidates and species proposed for listing);
- designated as rare, protected, or fully protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Code;
- designated a Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW);
- considered by CDFW to be a Watch List species with potential to become an SSC;
- defined as rare or endangered under Section 15380 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); or
- Having a California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) of 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, or 3.

In order to evaluate special-status species and/or their habitats with the potential to occur in the Study Area and/or be impacted by the proposed project, HELIX obtained lists of special-status species known to occur and/or having the potential to occur in the Study Area and vicinity from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS; USFWS 2021), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS; CNPS 2021), and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB; CDFW 2021).

Reconnaissance Survey

A biological reconnaissance survey was conducted on September 22, 2021, by Stephanie McLaughlin, M.S., ISA Certified Arborist (WE-12922A) between 0900 and 1100 hours. The weather during the field survey was warm and sunny with light wind. The Study Area was systematically surveyed on foot to ensure total search coverage. All plant and animal species observed onsite during the surveys were recorded and all biological communities occurring onsite were characterized.

Arborist Inventory

An arborist inventory was conducted on September 22, 2021, by Stephanie McLaughlin, M.S., ISA Certified Arborist (WE-12922A). The following data was collected for trees on or overhanging the Study Area with a diameter at standard height (DSH) of six-inches or greater: species, trunk diameter at 54-inches above the ground (DSH), dripline radius, estimated height, and overall health and structure of the tree. Health, structure, and overall condition was rated on a five-point scale of 0 (dead), 1 (severe decline), 2 (declining), 3 (fair), 4 (good), or 5 (excellent). Comments such as number of trunks, irregularities, scars or other growth characteristics or vigor indicators were recorded for each tree. Recommendations for preservation or removal were made based on each tree's condition. The location of each tree was recorded using an EOS Systems Arrow 100 Global Navigation Satellite System receiver with sub-meter accuracy. Trees on the site were identified in the field with pre-printed numbered tags.

Project Setting

The site is located within an industrial area in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento and is surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development. The site is generally bordered by residential parcels to the south and by industrial developments to the north, east, and west.

The site is a vacant lot that is in a relatively disturbed condition. Historic aerial imagery indicates that the Study Area has been subject to a variety of re-occurring ground disturbance activities since 1947, including disking, staging of materials, mowing, and construction. The contours of the Study Area reflect a history of fill, grading, and other modifications resulting in tire ruts, small hills, and debris piles currently making up the microtopography of the Study Area.

The site appears to have been cleared of any trees and other woody vegetation prior to 1947 and was used for agriculture for a period of time. The study area has been comprised of grassland and herbaceous cover since 1993 (NETR). The transportation and shipping center adjacent to the western border of the Study Area was constructed in 1998 and the utility facility in the northwestern corner of the Study Area was constructed in 2002 as seen on aerial imagery (Google Earth®). Currently, there are several large piles of construction debris and concrete in the northwest corner of the Study Area. There is a population of un-housed people living around the perimeter of the Study Area and there is a significant amount of trash and debris scattered throughout the Study Area.

Biological Reconnaissance Survey Results

Habitat Types in the Project Site

Ruderal/Disturbed

Ruderal/disturbed habitat occurs in areas that are heavily disturbed by past or ongoing human activities but retain a soil substrate. Ruderal/disturbed areas may be sparsely to densely vegetated, but do not support a recognizable community or species assemblage. Vegetative cover is usually herbaceous and dominated by a wide variety of weedy non-native species or a few ruderal native species.

Ruderal/disturbed habitat, which totals approximately 2.38-acres, comprises the entirety of the site. This habitat in the Study Area is either unvegetated or heavily dominated by a dense cover of non-native annual grasses, with small patches of native and non-native grasses and forbs. Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), and ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*) make up the majority of the herbaceous cover in the Study Area in terms of percent cover, with other non-native grasses such as medusa head (*Elymus caput-medusae*) also present at high density in some areas. Nearly all herbaceous plant species observed during the biological reconnaissance are non-natives associated with disturbance. The Study Area is subject to regular disturbance and at the time of the biological reconnaissance survey the area had recently been mown.

Special Status Species Evaluations

Special-Status Plant Species

A total of six regionally occurring special-status plant species were identified during the database queries and desktop review. Five of these species occur in wetland habitats such as vernal pools and seasonal wetlands: dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*), legenere (*Legenere limosa*), Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*), Sacramento Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia viscida),* and Sanford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria sanfordii*). One of these species occurs in mesic soils: Ahart's dwarf rush (*Juncus leiospermus* var. *ahartii)*.

There is no suitable habitat for special-status plant species on the site and there have been no reported occurrences of special-status plant species on or adjacent to the site in the CNDDB. The site is vegetated with ruderal vegetation and has been disturbed.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

A total of 21 regionally occurring special-status wildlife species were identified during the database searches and desktop review. The majority of the special-status wildlife species are associated with aquatic habitats of the adjacent Sacramento Valley such as rivers, sloughs, and freshwater wetlands, including vernal pools. The remaining species are associated with open areas with native or naturalized vegetation and scattered trees.

There are no reported occurrences of special-status animal species on or adjacent to the site and no special-status species were observed during the biological reconnaissance survey. However, the site provides suitable habitat for white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and other common nesting raptors and migratory birds.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

The Study Area and immediate vicinity provides nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of native birds common to urbanized areas, such as mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), and American robin (*Turdus migratorius*). Nests were not observed during surveys; however, a variety of migratory birds have the potential to nest in and adjacent to the site, in trees, shrubs and on the ground in vegetation.

Project activities such as clearing and grubbing during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31) could result in injury or mortality of eggs and chicks directly through destruction or indirectly through forced nest abandonment due to noise and other disturbance. Needless destruction of nests, eggs, and chicks would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and a significant impact.
The recommended mitigation measures for nesting migratory birds and raptors in the following section would reduce potential impacts to nesting migratory birds and raptors to less than significant.

Protected Trees

Four trees are present on the site that include one Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), one blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), one valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), and one Bradford pear (*Pyrus calleryana*). The City of Sacramento protects trees under Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. A permit is required to remove native oaks (*Quercus* spp.), buckeyes (*Aesculus californicus*), or sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*) having a diameter at standard height (i.e., 54-inches above grade; DSH) of 12-inches or more, or any tree having a DSH of 24-inches or more, on undeveloped private parcels inside the City limits. For a tree with a common root system that branches at the ground, DSH means the sum of the diameter of the largest trunk and one-half the cumulative diameter of the remaining trunks at 4.5-ft above natural grade.

Two (Tree #326 and #327) of the four trees located in the study area are protected trees as defined by Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. Tree #327 is a valley oak in good condition. Tree #326 is a Goodding's black willow rated in declining condition and has been recommended for removal. All trees in the study area would need to be removed to facilitate development of the proposed project (Table 4).

Table 4
Trees Located in the Study Area

Tree Number	Species	DSH (inches)	Height (feet)	Dripline (feet)	Structure	Health	Condition	Notes
325	*Quercus douglasii* blue oak	7	17	8	3	4	4	epicormics
326	*Salix gooddingii* Goodding's black willow	23.4, 18, 7.2, 9 **Total – 40.5**	16	18	2	2	2	co-dominant leaders, included bark, significant

Tree Number	Species	DSH (inches)	Height (feet)	Dripline (feet)	Structure	Health	Condition	Notes
								crown dieback, broken branches **Recommend Removal**
327	*Quercus lobata* valley oak	9, 7.5, 8 **Total – 16.75**	22	10	3	4	3	co-dominant leaders, included bark
328	*Pyrus calleryana* Bradford pear	15.5	35	17	4	4	4	included bark, growing into power lines

Sensitive Natural Communities

Due to the general lack in abundance of native plant species, there are no terrestrial or aquatic sensitive natural communities in the study area.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.3 of the Master EIR evaluated the effects of the 2035 General Plan on biological resources within the City. The Master EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the 2035 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2035 General Plan. Policy ER 2.1.5 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the

potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate; and Policy ER 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the California Department Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

The Master EIR discussed biological resources in Chapter 4.3. The Master EIR concluded that policies in the general plan, combined with compliance with the California Endangered Species Act, Natomas Basin HCP (when applicable) and CEQA would minimize the impacts on special-status species to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 4.3-1), and that the general plan policies, along with similar compliance with local, state and federal regulation would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level for habitat for special-status invertebrates, birds, amphibians and reptiles, mammals and fish (Impacts 4.3-3-6).

Given the prevalence of rivers and streams in the incorporated area, impacts to riparian habitat is a common concern. Riparian habitats are known to exist throughout the City, especially along the Sacramento and American rivers and their tributaries. The Master EIR discussed impacts of development adjacent to riparian habitat that could disturb wildlife species that rely on these areas for shelter and food, and could also result in the degradation of these areas through the introduction of feral animals and contaminants that are typical of urban uses. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regulates potential impacts on lakes, streams, and associated riparian (streamside or lakeside) vegetation through the issuance of Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreements (SAA) (per Fish and Game Code Section 1602), and provides guidance to the City as a resource agency. While there are no federal regulations that specifically mandate the protection of riparian vegetation, federal regulations set forth in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act address areas that potentially contain riparian-type vegetation, such as wetlands.

The general plan calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals and drainage ditches that support riparian resources (Policy ER 2.1.5) and wetlands (Policy ER 2.1.6) and requires habitat assessments and impact compensation for projects (Policy ER 2.1.10). has adopted a standard that requires coordination with state and federal agencies if a project has the potential to affect other species of special concern or habitats (including regulatory waters and wetlands) protected by agencies or natural resource organizations (Policy 2.1.11).

Implementation of 2035 General Plan Policy ER 2.1.5 would reduce the magnitude of potential impacts by requiring a 1:1 replacement of riparian habitat lost to development. While this would help mitigate impacts on riparian habitat, large open areas of riparian habitat used by wildlife could be lost and/or degraded directly and indirectly through development under the 2035 General Plan. Given the extent of urban development designated in the general plan, the preservation and/or restoration of riparian habitat would likely occur outside of the City limits. The Master EIR concluded that the permanent loss of riparian habitat would be a less-than-significant impact. (Impact 4.3-7)

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The site is proposed for the development of a truck and trailer repair facility with an administrative and office building, three repair bays, a concrete apron, and a truck and trailer parking area. Hazardous materials on the site would be limited to concrete, oils, gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and solvents used during construction. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure. Use of such materials would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous material. No sensitive plants have the potential to occur on the site, and with implementation of the applicable regulations risk of exposure to wildlife would be avoided. The project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effect*** on sensitive plant or animal populations related to exposure to hazardous materials.

Question B

There are no reported occurrences of special-status animal species on or adjacent to the site and no special-status species were observed during the biological reconnaissance survey. However, the site provides

suitable habitat for white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and other common nesting raptors and migratory birds. These species are discussed briefly below.

Burrowing Owl (CDFW Species of Special Concern)

Burrowing owls are year-round residents of most parts of California, though local seasonal movements are common and populations in northeastern California and high elevations may migrate to lower elevations during the winter. Burrowing owls inhabit underground burrows, especially those of California ground squirrels (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*), and artificial holes such as pipes, culverts, and crevices in debris piles. Suitable habitat is open and relatively flat, with short vegetation, low perches or mounds, and abundant rodent and insect prey. Common examples of suitable habitat include agricultural fields, pastures, grasslands, deserts, and disturbed places. Breeding season for burrowing owl is April through August (CDFW 2012).

No burrowing owls or sign were observed during the biological reconnaissance, which included a thorough search for this species. However, there are several reported occurrences of burrowing owl in the CNDDB in the vicinity of the study area. The nearest extant occurrence of burrowing owl is 0.4 mile southeast of the study area near Auburn Blvd and there are three other reported occurrences of burrowing owl within roughly 2 miles of the study area and 15 total occurrences within 5 miles (CDFW 2021).

Ruderal/disturbed areas in the study area provide marginally suitable habitat for burrowing owl. Previous disking and staging of materials has removed any small mammal burrows; however, there are several small debris piles that provide elements of suitable habitat. The site is too small in size to support significant burrowing owl foraging and is surrounded by disturbed industrial and residential parcels. The high levels of human presence and disturbance at the site likely discourage occupation of the site by burrowing owls, as does the presence of dogs and other animals. However, there is a potential for this species to occur on the site.

If burrowing owls are residing in the study area or on adjacent properties, the project would have potential for adverse effects through injury or mortality, displacement, and loss of habitat. Injury or mortality to individual adults and young, or mortality of eggs and chicks due to forced nest abandonment by adults, would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and a significant impact. Loss of occupied habitat including nesting burrows, satellite burrows, foraging habitat, dispersal habitat, wintering habitat, and linkages is considered a potentially significant impact to the local and regional populations of burrowing owl (CDFW 2012).

The recommended Mitigation Measure BIO-1 for nesting burrowing owl in the following section would reduce potential impacts to this species to ***less than significant.***

Swainson's Hawk (State Threatened)

Swainson's hawk is a breeding season migrant in California that winters in South America; migrants typically arrive and begin scouting nest locations in mid-April (SHTAC 2000). Swainson's hawks return to California in March and begin establishing nesting territories. Nest construction continues through April and eggs are usually laid between early April and early May. Incubation lasts 34-35 days, and the young fledge 42-44 days after hatching. The Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SHTAC) defines five survey periods based on breeding season phenology (SHTAC 2000): January – March 20 (Period I); March 20 – April 5 (Period II – courtship/territory establishment); April 5 – April 20 (Period III – nest building); April 21 – June 10 (Period IV – incubating/hatching); June 10 – July 30 (Period V – post-fledging). These dates are based on a typical breeding season for the majority of birds in the Delta region (San Joaquin County to Yolo County) and may shift earlier with decreasing latitude. Populations are largest in the southern Sacramento Valley and high deserts (CDFW 1994).

Swainson's hawks typically nest in large trees in riparian woodlands, tall trees in upland stands (especially eucalyptus), and solitary trees in agricultural areas. Isolation from human foot traffic is important to nest site selection, though hawks are less sensitive to vehicle traffic. Nests are typically concealed in dense canopy. Individuals exhibit high nest site fidelity over their lifetime. Swainson's hawks forage opportunistically over a

large area, soaring up to 10 miles from the nest to hunt small mammals and insects in agricultural fields and grasslands (Estep 1989). Suitable foraging habitat is open, with low vegetation (less than 12 inches) and abundant prey. Foraging activity is highest in agricultural fields during activities that drive prey into the open such as harvesting, disking, flooding, and burning (Estep 1989). Major prey species include California voles, pocket gophers, deer mice, California ground squirrels, mourning doves, ring-necked pheasants, meadowlarks and other passerines, grasshoppers, crickets, and beetles (Estep 1989). Swainson's hawks are active aerial predators that hunt in low circling flights over fields, often following farm equipment. During the breeding season, Swainson's hawks eat mainly vertebrates, shifting to insects during migration (Palmer 1988).

Agricultural lands considered suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk include alfalfa, fallow fields, low-growing row, or field crops (e.g., beets, tomatoes), dry-land and irrigated pasture, rice (when not flooded), and cereal crops (CDFW 1994). Suitability for Swainson's hawk foraging is driven largely by the interaction of two factors: prey base supported by the crop type, and accessibility of prey to aerial predators (Estep 1989). Accessibility of prey is determined by vegetation structure; dense cover of vegetation over approximately 12-inches height renders prey largely inaccessible and reduces foraging use (Estep 1989, 2009).

Swainson's hawk was not observed in the Study Area during the biological survey and the site lacks trees that would typically be used by Swainson's hawk for nesting. However, there are 29 reported occurrences of Swainson's hawk in the CNDDB within a five-mile radius of the Study Area (CDFW 2021), with the closest occurrences being approximately 1.6-miles north of the Study Area in Hansen Ranch Regional Park. There is a reported occurrence from 2010 approximately 1.9-miles south of the study area in an urban area along West El Camino Ave.

Due to the proximity of numerous Swainson's hawk nests within 5 miles of the study area, this species could potentially use the ruderal/disturbed habitat in the site for occasional foraging, although it would not be expected to be a significant food source for Swainson's hawk due to the small size of the parcel and the developed surroundings. In addition, there is a low potential for Swainson's hawk to nest in trees in the study area.

The project has the potential to impact nesting Swainson's hawk if this species were to nest in or adjacent to the study area. Within an urban setting such as the Study Area, CDFW considers intensive new disturbances (such as would occur during construction activities associated with the proposed project) within 0.25-mile of an active nest to be a potential impact (CDFW 1994). Impacts to nesting Swainson's hawk could include disruption of courtship or nesting behavior, abandonment of eggs or young, or forced fledging. Potential impacts to nesting Swainson's hawks would be considered a significant impact. The proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 2.38-acres of ruderal/disturbed habitat that provides medium to low quality Swainson's hawk foraging habitat to unsuitable uses. The CDFW has determined that parcels with foraging habitat of five acres or more in size are recognized to be the minimum required for viable foraging habitat for this species (CDFW 1994). Therefore, loss of foraging habitat as a result of site development would not be considered a significant impact to the regional population of Swainson's hawk.

The recommended Mitigation Measure BIO-2 for nesting Swainson's hawk in the following section would reduce potential impacts to this species to ***less than significant.***

White-tailed Kite (CDFW Fully Protected)

White-tailed kite is a year-round resident in coastal and valley lowlands, where it inhabits herbaceous and open stages of most habitat types. Individuals forage in grasslands, farmlands, and wetlands, preying mostly on small diurnal mammals. Nests are built near the top of dense tree stands, usually near open foraging areas (Zeiner et al. 1988).

No white-tailed kites were observed during the biological reconnaissance survey conducted for the proposed project. The nearest extant occurrence of white-tailed kite is 1.3-miles northwest of the study area near Hansen Ranch Regional Park (CDFW 2021). Foraging habitat is present in the ruderal vegetation. However, habitat for white-tailed kite is marginal due to the disturbed nature of this site.

No adverse effects to white-tailed kite foraging are anticipated as a result of the loss of ruderal/disturbed habitat that would occur due to development of the proposed project. Non-breeding adults could readily avoid contact with construction equipment or personnel by moving out of the construction area. Displacement of non-breeding adults would not be a significant impact. The project has potential for adverse effects to white-tailed kite through nest disturbance leading to destruction of eggs or nestlings if this species were to nest in or adjacent to the study area. Eggs and young still dependent on the nest would be susceptible to injury or mortality through physical contact or through nest abandonment caused by displacement of adults. Destruction of eggs or young would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and a significant impact

The recommended Mitigation Measure BIO-3 for nesting migratory birds and raptors in the following section would reduce potential impacts to this species to ***less than significant.***

Migratory Birds and Raptors

Migratory and non-game birds are protected during the nesting season by California Fish and Game Code. The study area and immediate vicinity provides nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of native birds common to urbanized areas, such as mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), and American robin (*Turdus migratorius*). Nests were not observed during surveys; however, a variety of migratory birds have the potential to nest in and adjacent to the site, in trees, shrubs and on the ground in vegetation.

Project activities such as clearing and grubbing during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31) could result in injury or mortality of eggs and chicks directly through destruction or indirectly through forced nest abandonment due to noise and other disturbance. Needless destruction of nests, eggs, and chicks would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and a significant impact.

The recommended Mitigation Measure BIO-3 for nesting migratory birds and raptors in the following section would reduce potential impacts to nesting migratory birds and raptors to ***less than significant.***

Question C

The project does not contain any jurisdictional waters. Therefore, no impact to jurisdictional waters would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

Four trees are present on the site that include one Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), one blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), one valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), and one Bradford pear (*Pyrus calleryana*). The City of Sacramento protects trees under Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. A permit is required to remove native oaks (*Quercus* spp.), buckeyes (*Aesculus californicus*), or sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*) having a diameter at standard height (i.e., 54-inches above grade; DSH) of 12-inches or more, or any tree having a DSH of 24-inches or more, on undeveloped private parcels inside the City limits. Two (Tree #326 and #327) of the four trees located in the Study Area are protected trees as defined by Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. Tree #327 is a valley oak in good condition. Tree #326 is a Goodding's black willow rated in declining condition and has been recommended for removal. All trees in the study area would need to be removed to facilitate development of the proposed project.

Two (Tree #326 and #327) of the four trees located in the study area are protected trees as defined by Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. Tree #327 is a valley oak in good condition. Tree #326 is a Goodding's black willow rated in declining condition and has been recommended for removal.

Mitigation for tree removal includes on- or off-site replacement, payment of in-lieu fees, or credit for preservation of existing trees. Tree replacement should be done at a ratio of one-inch DSH of tree replaced for each inch DSH of tree removed (1:1 ratio). The replacement value of planted trees is as follows:

- A tree in a 15-gallon container or smaller = one-inch DSH.
- A tree in a 24-inch box = two-inch DSH.
- A tree in a 36-inch box or larger = three-inch DSH.

Replacement trees should be the same species as those removed or a species that is acceptable to the director.

The proposed project has an extensive tree planting plan which includes the installation of 30-feet to 50-feet diameter trees in the study area upon project completion. Trees would be a minimum of 15-gallon container size and all trees would be planted in the center of a 35-sf planter box. The tree planting plan has several tree species incorporated, including Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Carob Tree, Blue Oak, and Bald Cypress. Please refer to Figure 4 in Appendix A for the Landscaping Plan.

As Tree #326 has been recommended for removal, no mitigation should be required. Tree #327 is protected and will require mitigation for removal. Tree # 327 has a DSH of 16.75. Tree # 327 would be replaced with a 50 DSH Bald Cypress. Mitigation for this tree should be covered by the tree planting plan for the proposed project.

The recommended Mitigation Measure BIO-4 for protected trees would reduce potential impacts to protected trees to ***less than significant.***

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Burrowing Owl

Prior to the commencement of construction activities (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) a survey for burrowing owl should be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey should occur within 30 days of the start of construction activities. Surveys should be conducted in accordance with the following:

- A survey for burrows and owls should be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire study area and in areas within 150-meters (~500-feet) of the project impact zone.

- Pedestrian survey transects should be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30-meters (~100-feet) and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. Surveyor(s) should maintain a minimum distance of 50-meters (~160-feet) from any owls or occupied burrows. It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons.

- If no occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found in the survey area, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings should be prepared and no further mitigation is necessary.

- If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found, then a complete burrowing owl survey is required. This consists of a minimum of four site visits conducted on four separate days, which must also be consistent with the Survey Method, Weather Conditions, and Time of Day sections of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "*Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*" (March 2012). A survey report should be prepared that is consistent with the Survey Report section of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "*Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*" (March 2012).

- If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found the applicant should contact the County and consult with CDFW prior to construction and will be required to submit a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan (subject to the approval of the Environmental Coordinator and in consultation with California Fish and Wildlife). This plan must document all proposed measures, including avoidance, minimization, exclusion, relocation, or other measures, and include a plan to monitor mitigation success. The CDFW "*Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*" (March 2012) should be used in the development of the mitigation plan.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Swainson's hawk

Pre-construction surveys should be conducted to determine if there are nesting Swainson's hawk within approximately 0.5-mile of the study area. The purpose of the survey requirement is to ensure that construction activities do not affect nesting hawks, potentially resulting in nest abandonment or other harm to nesting success. Prior to initiation of construction activities during the Swainson's hawk breeding season (March 1 through September 15), the applicant should determine the presence of active Swainson's hawk nests in and within approximately 0.5-mile of the study area using the most recent published survey protocols (i.e., three surveys by a qualified biologist in each of the two periods preceding the construction start date; SHTAC 2000). If an active Swainson's hawk nest is discovered, the applicant should initiate consultation with CDFW to determine what measures need to be implemented in order to ensure that nesting hawks remain undisturbed. The measures selected would depend on many variables, including the distance of activities from the nest, the types of activities, and whether the landform between the nest and activities provides any kind of natural screening. If no active nests are discovered, no further action would be required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to White-Tailed Kite, Other Raptors, and Migratory Birds

The study area provides suitable nesting habitat for native songbirds and large trees adjacent to the site provide nesting habitat for white-tailed kite and other raptors. Removal of vegetation containing active nests would potentially result in destruction of eggs and/or chicks; noise, dust, and other anthropogenic stressors in the vicinity of an active nest could lead to forced nest abandonment and mortality of eggs and/or chicks. Needless destruction of eggs or chicks would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and a significant impact. Pre-construction surveys should be conducted prior to project implementation to determine if nesting birds are present on or adjacent to the site, so that measures could be implemented if needed to avoid harming nesting birds.

The following mitigation is recommended to reduce potential project impacts to nesting birds:

- If project (construction) ground-disturbing or vegetation clearing and grubbing activities commence during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey no more than 14 days prior to initiation of project activities and again immediately prior to construction. The survey area should include suitable raptor nesting habitat within approximately 500-feet of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the study area can be surveyed from the site or from public roads using binoculars or spotting scopes). Pre-construction surveys are not required in areas where project activities have been continuous since prior to February 1, as determined by a qualified biologist. Areas that have been inactive for more than 14 days during the avian breeding season must be re-surveyed prior to resumption of project activities. If no active nests are identified, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are identified, the following measure is required:

    - A suitable buffer (e.g., approximately 500-feet for raptors; 100-feet for passerines) should be established by a qualified biologist around active nests and no construction activities within the buffer should be allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest, or the nest has failed). Encroachment into the buffer may occur at the discretion of a qualified biologist. Any encroachment into the buffer should be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Protected Trees

Trees on the site should be protected from removal as well as from ground disturbance within the protection zone without a tree permit from the City of Sacramento. Prior to any removal, or ground disturbance within a radius of one-foot greater than the maximum dripline of a protected tree, the project proponent should obtain a tree permit from the City. The person requesting the permit, or the property owner may also be required to pay the cost of obtaining and planting the replacement trees.

FINDINGS

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 through BIO-4 would ensure that pre-construction surveys are conducted to determine the presence or absence of special-status species within the project site and identifies necessary steps to ensure the development would not result in impacts to special-status species. Thus, all significant environmental effects of the proposed project would be mitigated to less than significant levels, and the proposed project would not result in any new project-specific significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources. All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Biological Resources can be mitigated to a ***less than significant level.***

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento and the surrounding area are known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout the city, some in deeply buried contexts. One of the tools used to identify the potential for cultural resources to be present in the project area is the 2035 General Plan Background Report. Generalized areas of high sensitivity for cultural resources are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American Rivers and moderate sensitivity was identified near other watercourses. The proposed project site is not adjacent to these high or moderate sensitivity units shown in the 2035 General Plan Background Report.

The 2035 General Plan land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and impacts on sensitive cultural resources. High sensitivity areas may be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today. Recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the downtown area is highly sensitive for both historic period archaeological - and pre-contact indigenous resources. Native American burials and artifacts were found in 2005 during construction of the New City Hall and historic period archaeological resources are abundant downtown due to the evolving development of the area and, in part, to the raising of the surface street level in the 1860s and 1870s, which created basements out of the first floors of many buildings.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; or,

2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource; or,

3. A substantial adverse change in the significance of such resources.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources. See Chapter 4.4.

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10) and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.14). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort. (Policy HCR 2.1.15)

The Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable effect on historic resources and archaeological resources. (Impacts 4.4-1, 2)

Methods

A Cultural Resource Assessment Report was prepared by HELIX on November 12, 2021 (Appendix D). Data for the assessment was provided by an archaeological record's search at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), located at California State University, Sacramento; analyses of professional and academic literature related to the region; Native American outreach; and an intensive pedestrian survey of the project site.

Project Location

The project area is located in the City of Sacramento at 121 Morrison Avenue and is bounded by Harris Avenue to the north, existing light-industrial buildings to the east, Morrison Avenue to the south, and Opportunity Street to the west (see Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix D). The property comprises Sacramento County Assessor's Parcel Numbers 250-0025-005 and 250-0025-060. The area assessed for the purpose of this report is 2.38-acres and excludes the utility facility (Sump 87) owned and operated by the City of Sacramento.

Project Description

The proposed project would develop a two-story repair facility with an administrative and office building and three attached repair bays. Additionally, the project is proposing two concrete aprons, a truck and trailer parking area, an all-vehicle parking area, and landscaping around and within the project area. The project area would include one main 45-feet access driveway on its north side, off of Harris Avenue. The development would include a truck and trailer parking area and all vehicle parking area. The truck and trailer parking area would be surrounded by a 6-foot-high concrete masonry unit (CMU) block fence (masonry wall) on the west and south sides. On the north side, the fencing would consist of a 6-foot high masonry wall with wrought iron in every other section. A 6-foot-high chain link gate with privacy slats would allow for entrance and exit to the truck and trailer parking area on the east side. The project area is set back 25-feet from the surrounding streets on the north, south, and west sides. The two-story repair facility is set back 67-feet from the eastern boundary line.

Area of Potential Effects

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the geographic area or areas within which a project may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of significant archaeological or architectural resources. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of the project as well as by the types of cultural resources in the vicinity. For the purposes of this analysis, the APE for the proposed California Truck and Trailer Repair Project measures approximately 2.38 acres (Figure 3 in Appendix D) and corresponds to the project area described above. The APE's vertical dimension is currently unknown.

Archival Records Search

On September 23, 2021, an archival records search in support of the proposed project was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at California State University, Sacramento. The records search addressed all portions of the APE and an estimated 0.25-mile radius around the APE (hereafter referred to as the study area). Sources of information examined through this records search included previous survey and cultural resources files; the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); the

Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility; the OHP Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File; historical topographic maps; and historical aerial photographs.

Previous Studies

The records search revealed that three cultural studies that have previously been conducted within the study area, although none of these were conducted within the current APE (Table 5). None of the three studies resulted in the discovery of resources within the current study area.

Table 5.
Previous Studies Conducted within the Study Area

Support	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
000333	1987	Chavez, David	Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Natomas Area Circulation Improvements Project, Sacramento, CA	David Chavez & Associates
009209	2007	Olson, Richard V.	I-80 Across the Top Bus/Carpool Lane Project, Historic Property Survey Report	Caltrans
010351	2007	Hope, Andrew	Finding of No Adverse Effect for the Interstate-80 Bus/Carpool Lane (HOV Lane) Project in Sacramento County 03-Sac-80	Caltrans

Previously Documented Resources

The records search also determined that no cultural resources have previously been documented in either the APE or the study area.

Additional Sources of Information

Historic topographic maps (Rio Linda 1911, 1950, 1951, and 1967, 1975) and historic aerial photographs (1947, 1957, 1964, 1966, and 1993, 1998, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018) show that the project area was in agricultural use from at least 1947 through 1966, with a small residence/ farmhouse located on the eastern side of the APE. By 1993 however, all agricultural activity within the APE appears to have ceased, and the residence/farmhouse had become overgrown with vegetation. Sometime between 1993 and 1998 the warehouse/industrial structure currently adjacent east of the APE was built, and the residence/farmhouse that once stood on the eastern side of the APE was destroyed and its debris removed from the site. No additional modifications to the APE could be discerned from aerial photographs between 1998 and the present (NETR Online 2021).

Native American Outreach

On September 22, 2021, HELIX requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File (SLF) for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the APE. A written response received from the NAHC on November 1, 2021, stated that the results of the SLF search were positive.

On November 2, 2021, HELIX sent letters to 14 Native American contacts that recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of information related to cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area. As of the date of this report, no responses have been received from any of the contacts.

Fieldwork

Intensive Pedestrian Survey

On October 1, 2021, HELIX Archaeologist Jentin Joe conducted a pedestrian survey to characterize any prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources located on the surface of the APE. During the survey the ground surface throughout the APE was examined for the presence of historic-era artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics), prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris), and other features that might represent human activity that took place more than 50 years ago.

The APE is flat and consists of undeveloped and minimally disturbed non-native annual grassland. The APE's environs consist of residential housing, commercial businesses, and industrial buildings. The dry grasses covered the entirety of the site, and their length and density obscured the surveyor's visibility of the ground surface in several portions of the survey area. Nonetheless, the soils that could be identified from the surface appeared to be compacted and are thought to consist of deliberately deposited fill.

No drainages, canals, ditches, or other water related features were encountered on the site. The only ground disturbances found during archeological survey consisted of a pile of broken pieces of concrete located within the northeastern portion of the APE and tire tread marks on the grassy field located in the center and eastern portions of the APE.

Cultural materials within the APE were limited to the aforementioned cement pieces, and stray pieces of modern garbage (plastic bags, bottles, etc.) likely associated with currently occupied homeless encampments in the vicinity of the APE. No historic-era or prehistoric artifacts or features were found during the survey.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The records search determined that three studies have previously been conducted within 0.25-mile of the APE, but the APE itself has not been surveyed for cultural resources. No resources have previously been documented within the APE's boundaries. A review of NAHC's Sacred Lands File returned a positive result, and HELIX sent letters to 14 Native American contracts that recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of local information related to cultural resources. HELIX Archaeologist Jentin Joe conducted a pedestrian survey of the APE on October 1, 2021. Ground visibility during the survey was moderate due to dense grass within the APE, and no cultural resources were found during the survey.

Due to the negative findings of the CRHIS records search and the lack of cultural resources identified during HELIX's intensive pedestrian survey of the APE, the APE can be assumed to have a low sensitivity for surficial cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures CUL-1 (a-c) proposed below intends to minimize any potential impact to buried, undiscovered cultural resources during project implementation to a level of ***less than significant.***

Question B

No paleontological resources or unique geologic features are known to exist within the project site. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as excavation and trenching, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered paleontological resources which would be a potentially significant impact. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 (a-c)described below, potential impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources would be reduced to a level of ***less than significant***.

Question C

No human remains are known to exist within the APE. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as excavation and trenching, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is also a potentially significant impact.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1(a-c)the potential for the proposed project to disturb previously undiscovered human remains would be reduced to a level of ***less than significant***.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR-1a: Conduct Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training Program Prior to Ground-Disturbing Activities.

The City shall require the applicant/contractor to provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology. The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations.

The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance.

CR-1b: In the Event that Cultural Resources Are Discovered During Construction, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Impacts and Procedures to Evaluate Resources.

If cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project's City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.

- Recommendations for avoidance of cultural resources will be reviewed by the City representative and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource.

- If the discovered cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective

fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.

- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area”.

If a cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of cultural resources:

- Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources-(CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.

If a cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall c assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record.

CR-1c: Implement Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during project-related construction activities or project planning, the City the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner’s findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains. The responsibilities of the City for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

Findings

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
5. ENERGY Would the project:			
A) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X
B) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X

Environmental Setting

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is a community-owned and not-for-profit utility that provides electric services to 900 square miles, including most of Sacramento County (SMUD 2020). Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) is an inventory-owned utility that provides electric and natural gas services to approximately 16 million people within a 70,000-square-mile service area in both northern and central California (PG&E 2020). SMUD is the primary electricity supplier, and PG&E is the primary natural gas supplier for the City of Sacramento and the project area.

Energy demand related to the proposed project would include energy directly consumed for space heating and cooling and proposed electric facilities and lighting. Indirect energy consumption would be associated with the generation of electricity at power plants. Transportation related energy consumption includes the use of fuels and electricity to power cars, trucks, and public transportation. Energy would also be consumed by equipment and vehicles used during project construction and routine maintenance activities.

Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and CAFE Standards

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 established nationwide fuel economy standards to conserve oil. Under this act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, is responsible for revising existing fuel economy standards and establishing new vehicle economy standards. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy program was established to determine vehicle manufacturer compliance with the government's fuel economy standards. Three Energy Policy Acts have been passed, in 1992, 2005, and 2007, to reduce dependence on foreign petroleum, provide tax incentives for alternative fuels, and support energy conservation.

Energy Policy Act of 1992 and 2005

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct) was passed to reduce the country's dependence on foreign petroleum and improve air quality. EPAct includes several parts intended to build an inventory of alternative fuel vehicles (AFV) in large, centrally fueled fleets in metropolitan areas. EPAct requires certain federal, state, and local government and private fleets to purchase a percentage of light-duty AFVs capable of running on alternative fuels each year. In addition, financial incentives are also included in EPAct. Federal tax deductions are allowed for businesses and individuals to cover the incremental cost of AFVs. States are also required by the act to consider a variety of incentive programs to help promote AFVs. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 provides renewed and expanded tax credits for electricity generated by qualified energy sources, such as landfill gas; provides bond financing, tax incentives, grants, and loan guarantees for clean

renewable energy and rural community electrification; and establishes a federal purchase requirement for renewable energy.

State of California Energy Efficiency Action Plan

The 2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan has three primary goals for the state: double energy efficiency savings by 2030 relative to a 2015 base year (per SB 350), expand energy efficiency in low-income and disadvantaged communities, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from buildings. This plan provides guiding principles and recommendations on how the state would achieve those goals. These recommendations include:

- identifying funding sources that support energy efficiency programs,
- identifying opportunities to improve energy efficiency through data analysis,
- using program designs as a way to encourage increased energy efficiency on the consumer end,
- improving energy efficiency through workforce education and training, and,
- supporting rulemaking and programs that incorporate energy demand flexibility and building decarbonization (CEC 2019).

California Green Building Standards

The energy consumption of new residential and nonresidential buildings in California is regulated by the state's Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Code). The California Energy Code was established by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. CEC updates the California Energy Code every 3 years with more stringent design requirements for reduced energy consumption, which results in the generation of fewer GHG emissions.

The 2019 California Energy Code was adopted by CEC on May 9, 2018 and applies to projects constructed after January 1, 2020. The 2019 California Energy Code is designed to move the State closer to its zero-net energy goals for new residential development. It does so by requiring all new residences to install enough renewable energy to offset all the electricity needs of each residential unit (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 6, Section 150.1(c)4). CEC estimates that the combination of mandatory on-site renewable energy and prescriptively required energy efficiency standards will result in a 53 percent reduction in new residential construction as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code. Non-residential buildings are anticipated to reduce energy consumption by 30 percent as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code primarily through prescriptive requirements for high-efficiency lighting (CEC 2018). The Energy Code is enforced through the local plan check and building permit process. Local government agencies may adopt and enforce additional energy standards for new buildings as reasonably necessary due to local climatologic, geologic, or topographic conditions, provided that these standards exceed those provided in the California Energy Code.

Transportation Related Regulations

Various regulatory and planning efforts are aimed at reducing dependency on fossil fuels, increasing the use of alternative fuels, and improving California's vehicle fleet. Senate Bill (SB) 375 aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG emission reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation. CARB, in consultation with the metropolitan planning organizations, provides each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in their respective regions for 2020 and 2035.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 2076 (Chapter 936, Statutes of 2000), CEC and the CARB prepared and adopted a joint agency report in 2003, Reducing California's Petroleum Dependence. Included in this report are recommendations to increase the use of alternative fuels to 20 percent of on-road transportation fuel use by 2020 and 30 percent by 2030, significantly increase the efficiency of motor vehicles, and reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (CEC and CARB 2003).

AB 1007 (Chapter 371, Statues of 2005) required CEC to prepare the State Alternative Fuels Plan to increase the use of alternative fuels in California.

In January 2012, CARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars program which combines the control of GHG emissions and criteria air pollutants, as well as requirements for greater numbers of zero-emission vehicles, into a single package of standards for vehicle model years 2017 through 2025. The program's zero-emission vehicle regulation requires battery, fuel cell, and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to account for up to 15 percent of California's new vehicle sales by 2025.

On August 2, 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA and EPA proposed the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule (SAFE Rule). Part One of the SAFE Rule revokes a waiver granted by EPA to the State of California under Section 209 of the CAA to enforce more stringent emission standards for motor vehicles than those required by EPA for the explicit purpose of GHG emission reduction, and indirectly, criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emission reduction. On March 31, 2020, Part Two of the SAFE Rule was published and would amend existing CAFE and tailpipe CO_2 emissions standards for passenger cars and light trucks and establish new standards covering model years 2021 through 2026.

GHG Reduction Regulations

Several regulatory measures such as AB 32 and the Climate Change Scoping Plan, EO B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197 were enacted to reduce GHGs and have the co-benefit of reducing California's dependency on fossil fuels and making land use development and transportation systems more energy efficient.

Renewable Energy Regulations

SB X1-2 of 2011 requires all California utilities to generate 33 percent of their electricity from renewables by 2020. SB X1-2 also requires the renewable electricity standard to be met increasingly with renewable energy that is supplied to the California grid from sources within, or directly proximate to, California. SB X1-2 mandates that renewables from these sources make up at least 50 percent of the total renewable energy for the 2011-2013 compliance period, at least 65 percent for the 2014-2016 compliance period, and at least 75 percent for 2016 and beyond.

SB 100, signed in September 2018, requires that all California utilities, including independently owned utilities, energy service providers, and community choice aggregators, supply 44 percent of retail sales from renewable resources by December 31, 2024, 50 percent of all electricity sold by December 31, 2026, 52 percent by December 31, 2027, and 60 percent by December 31, 2030. The law also requires that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all State agencies by December 31, 2045.

Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is designed to improve vehicle fuel economy and help reduce U.S. dependence on oil. It represents a major step forward in expanding the production of renewable fuels, reducing dependence on oil, and confronting global climate change. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 increases the supply of alternative fuel sources by setting a mandatory Renewable Fuel Standard requiring fuel producers to use at least 36 billion gallons of biofuel in 2022, which represents a nearly five-fold increase over current levels; and reduces U.S. demand for oil by setting a national fuel economy standard of 35 miles per gallon by 2020—an increase in fuel economy standards of 40 percent.

By addressing renewable fuels and the CAFE standards, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 builds upon progress made by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 in setting out a comprehensive national energy strategy for the 21st century.

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

Structures built would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2035 General Plan includes policies (see 2035 General Plan Energy Resources Goal U 6.1.1) and related policies to encourage energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, coordination with local utility providers and recruitment of businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

The Master EIR discussed energy conservation and relevant General Plan policies in section 6.3 (page 6-3). The discussion concluded that with implementation of the General Plan policies and energy regulation (e.g., Title 24) development allowed in the General Plan would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

See also Section 12, below, discussing impacts related to energy. The Master EIR concluded that implementation of state regulation, coordination with energy providers and implementation of General Plan policies would reduce the potential impacts from construction of new energy production or transmission facilities to a less-than-significant level.

Sacramento Climate Action Plan

The Sacramento CAP was adopted on February 14, 2012 by the Sacramento City Council and was incorporated into the 2035 General Plan. The Sacramento CAP includes GHG emission reduction targets, strategies, and implementation measures developed to help the City reach these targets. Reduction strategies address GHG emissions associated with transportation and land use, energy, water, waste management and recycling, agriculture, and open space.

Energy

Structures built would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2035 General Plan includes policies (see 2035 General Plan Energy Resources Goal U 6.1.1) and related policies to encourage energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, coordination with local utility providers and recruitment of businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

The Master EIR discussed energy conservation and relevant general plan policies in section 6.3 (page 6-3). The discussion concluded that with implementation of the general plan policies and energy regulation (e.g., Title 24) development allowed in the general plan would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The Master EIR concluded that implementation of state regulation, coordination with energy providers and implementation of general plan policies would reduce the potential impacts from construction of new energy production or transmission facilities to a less-than-significant level.

Standards of Significance

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

- result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation; or,
- and/or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Appendix G CEQA Guidelines establish significance thresholds that define when energy consumption is considered wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary. Compliance with CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. For example, energy would be required to transport people and goods to and from the project site. Energy use is discussed by anticipated use type below.

Construction

Construction of the project would require gasoline, diesel, and potentially other fuel sources to operate routine equipment for a short duration. Additionally, energy would be consumed by construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In accordance with the construction BMPs required by SMAQMD, the following practices would be implemented during project construction to reduce waste and energy consumption (SMAQMD 2021):

- Follow maintenance schedules to maintain equipment in optimal working order and rated energy efficiency, which would include, but not be limited to, regular replacement of filters, cleaning of compressor coils, burner tune-ups, lubrication of pumps and motors, proper vehicle maintenance, etc.
- Reduce on-site vehicle idling.
- In accordance with CALGreen criteria as well as state and local laws, at least 50 percent of on-site construction waste would be diverted from landfills through reuse and recycling.

Operational

Operation of the project would include the routine use and transport of equipment typical of this land use, such as concrete, oils, gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and solvents. Energy would be consumed by the workers of the facility, and those traveling to and from the facility for truck and trailer repair. Sourcing landscape irrigation water would also consume a small amount of energy. While vehicle trips associated with the project (primarily truck and employer trips) would be new to the roads in the immediate project vicinity, the project would not result in new truck trips or VMT in the state and the project is not anticipated to increase the use of transportation fuels in the state. Therefore, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy and the project would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question B

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy efficiency. The project would conform to all applicable state, federal, and local laws, and codes; therefore, the project would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Seismicity

As described in the MEIR, the City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and there are no known faults within the area. Fault rupture within the City is highly unlikely and, consequently, people or structures within the City would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, the MEIR identifies the entire City as being subject to potential damage from earthquake ground shaking at a maximum intensity of VII on the Modified Mercalli scale. The closest potentially active faults to the project site include the Foothills Fault System, located approximately 23 miles from Sacramento; the Great Valley fault, located 26 miles from Sacramento; and the Hunting Creek-Berryessa Fault, located 38 miles from Sacramento. The Foothills Fault System is considered capable of generating an earthquake with a Richter-Scale magnitude of 6.8; the Great Valley Fault is capable of generating an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.9; the Concord-Green Valley Fault is capable of generating an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.9, and the Hunting Creek-Berryessa Fault could generate a 6.9 magnitude earthquake. A major earthquake on any of these faults could cause strong ground shaking in vicinity of the project site.

Topography and Soils

The project site consists of relatively flat terrain, with elevation ranging from 21 to 24-feet above mean sea level. Soils in the project site consist of San Joaquin fine sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (NRCS 2020). These soils are characterized by moderately deep and well-drained soils that are formed in alluviation and derived from mixed but dominantly granitic rock sources (USDA 1999).

Regional Geology

The project site is located within the Sacramento Valley portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province of California. The Great Valley is bordered to the north by the Cascade and Klamath Ranges, to the west by the Coast Ranges, to the east by the Sierra Nevada, and to the south by the Transverse Ranges. The valley was formed by tilting of the Sierra Block with the western side dropping to form the valley and eastern side uplifting to form the Sierra Nevada. The valley is characterized by a thick sequence of sediments derived from erosion of the adjacent Sierra Nevada to the east and the Coast Ranges to the west. These sedimentary rocks are mainly Cretaceous in age. These deposits typically consist of silt, sand and clay deposited by drainages similar to present-day stream and river systems.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the City. Implementation of identified policies in the 2035 General Plan reduced all effects to a less-than-significant level. Policy EC 1.1.1 requires regular review of the City's seismic and geologic safety standards, and Policy EC 1.1.2 requires geotechnical investigations for project sites to identify and respond to geologic hazards, when present.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

Geologic Hazards

The project site is not located on or in the vicinity of an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone; therefore, the potential for fault rupture on the proposed project site is considered low. However, ground shaking may occur periodically in Sacramento as a result of distant earthquakes. The project site is in the area of the City that is topographically flat. Seismically induced landslides or landslides induced by soil failure typically occurs on slopes with gradients of 30 percent or higher (City of Sacramento 2015b). According to the City's 2035 General Plan and NRCS Web Soil Survey, the existing on-site soil range from 0 to 3 percent slopes (NRCS 2020). Considering that the project site is topographically flat, the potential for seismically induced or soil failure landslides does not exist.

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations). The state earth protection law (California Health and Safety Code Section 191000 et seq.) requires that buildings be designed to resist stresses produced by lateral forces caused by earthquakes. Earthquake resistant design and materials are required to meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the CBSC Seismic Risk Zone 3 improvements. The proposed project would be required to comply with CBSC requirements and the City's 2035 General Plan and MEIR, which require project applicants to prepare site-specific geotechnical evaluations and conformance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

Soil liquefaction is the loss of strength of low- to no-cohesion soils (usually sands) that occurs when pore water pressure exceeds the confining stress (weight) of the soils (CDC 2021a). Liquefaction normally occurs only under saturated conditions and in soils with a low relative density. Liquefaction can occur during earthquakes as vibrations induce soils to readjust to a more compact state. Experience has shown that earthquake induced liquefaction normally occurs only within the upper 50 to 60-feet of the soil profile. According to the NRCS, soils at the project site include 0 to 3 percent slopes. The proposed project site is not located within a State-Designated Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction (CDC 2021b). Thus, the potential for the project site to experience geologic or seismic hazards related to liquefaction or fault rupture is low.

Soil Hazards

The project site had previously been graded completely. The proposed project would have already complied with the City's standards set forth in the "Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control." The project would have already complied with the City's grading ordinance (Chapter 15.88 of Sacramento City Code) which specifies construction standards to minimize erosion and runoff. As discussed above, liquefiable soils are not anticipated to pose a risk to the proposed project. According to the NRCS, the project site is not located in an area subject to risk from expansive soils (NRCS 2020). Thus, proposed project would not pose a hazard due to the presence of expansive soils.

Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the City's 2035 General Plan and, as discussed in the Master EIR, the policies included in the City's 2035 General Plan as well as the requirements of the CBSC and the City's Code would ensure that development in compliance with the City's 2035 General Plan would not result in significant impacts related to seismic or soil hazards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

The project site is vacant, graded, and undeveloped, and it contains no known hazardous materials (SWRCB 2021; DTSC 2021; USEPA 2021). The project site is not in the Tsunami Hazard Zone and is not located in the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip (CDC 2021c). The project site had been graded completely. The site has been vacant since 1998 and was previously used as an orchard with a farmhouse on site. No hazardous materials are known to exist at the project site.

There is one main 45-ft access driveway on the north side of the property off of Harris Avenue that will be used for emergency purposes. The City of Sacramento Fire Department (SFD) is the first responder for fire, accident, and hazardous materials emergencies in the vicinity of the project site. The Department maintains two Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Teams at fire stations in the project region; Truck 5 is stationed downtown at 8th and Broadway, and Truck 20 at Arden Way and Del Paso Boulevard. The HazMat Teams respond to hazardous materials incidents. All members of the HazMat Teams are trained in accordance with National Fire Protection Association standards and are certified by the California Specialized Training Institute as Hazardous Materials Specialists. The teams would be expected to respond to any hazardous materials release at the project site or in the vicinity of the project site.

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with these regulations respecting asbestos may result in a Notice of Violation being issued by the AQMD and civil penalties under state and/or federal law, in addition to possible action by U.S. EPA under federal law. Federal law covers a number of different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (40 CFR § 61.145).

SMAQMD Rule 902 and Commercial Structures

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

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

The administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to any demolition of commercial structures, regardless of the amount of RACM. To determine the amount of RACM in a structure, Rule 902 requires that a survey be conducted prior to demolition or renovation unless:

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

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

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities;

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials; or

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 4.6. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities, and exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the general plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2035 general Plan, including PHS 3.1.1 (investigation of sites for contamination) and PHS 3.1.2 (preparation of hazardous materials actions plans when appropriate) were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

While the project used to be an orchard with a farmhouse before 1998, no permanent structures are currently or have recently been part of the project site. According to records searches of the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database, Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database, and United States Environmental Protection Agency's Superfund National Priorities List, there are no reported hazardous materials present on the project site and the site is not documented as having contaminated soils (SWRCB 2021; DTSC 2021; USEPA 2021).

The project would construct a two-story repair facility and truck and trailer parking lot that would include paved areas, fencing, and landscaping on site. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb the 2.38-acre site. Furthermore, construction and operation of the proposed project would involve the use of routine equipment typical of this land use, such as concrete and other potentially hazardous materials such as oils, gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and solvents. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure. Use of such materials would be required to comply will all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous material. Although the project would

include disturbance of a significant portion of the project site, since no known contaminated soils are present on the site, construction would not have the potential to result in impacts related to the disturbance or upset of hazardous materials.

Based on the above, the construction activities associated with the proposed project would not result in the exposure of construction workers or other sensitive receptors to contaminated soils and ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what was previously analyzed in the Master EIR would occur.

Question B

The Master EIR determined that buildout of the 2035 General Plan could necessitate demolition of existing structures which could potentially result in the exposure of construction workers or other sensitive receptors to hazardous substances such as asbestos or lead-based paints. The project site is currently vacant and has been vacant since 1998. Thus, demolition of existing structures would not be necessary during implementation of the proposed project. As discussed above, there are no known hazardous materials present on the site. Because the proposed project would not include demolition of an existing on-site structure and no hazardous materials are present on site, the potential to expose construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to asbestos-containing materials is low. Therefore, the proposed project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what was previously analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question C

Sacramento County groundwater maps indicate that groundwater in the area is most often at depths between 25 and 40-feet below the ground surface. The proposed project would not be expected to require any on-site dewatering activities. The proposed project would include construction activities in a 2.38-acre project area, including the paving of the project site, relocation of utilities, and development of a two-story repair facility and truck and trailer parking lot. Groundwater would not be anticipated to be encountered during construction of the site, as the site was already graded and vacant. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential to expose construction workers and pedestrians to contaminated groundwater and implementation of the proposed project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None Required.

Findings

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in a developed area of Sacramento, approximately 5-miles north of the American River. The site is currently vacant and does not contain any impervious surface. As a result, stormwater runoff is handled by existing City stormwater infrastructure.

The City of Sacramento's Grading Ordinance requires that development projects comply with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP). The SQIP outlines the priorities, key elements, strategies, and evaluation methods of the City's Stormwater Management Program. The Program is based on the NPDES Municipal Stormwater Discharge Permit and includes pollution reduction activities for construction sites, industrial sites, illegal discharges and illicit connections, new development, and municipal operations. In addition, before the onset of any construction activities, where the disturbed area is one acre or more in size, projects are required to obtain coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit and include erosion and sediment control plans. BMPs may consist of a wide variety of measures taken to reduce pollutants in stormwater and other non-point source runoff. Measures that reduce or eliminate post-construction-related water quality problems range from source controls, such as reduced surface disturbance, to treatment of polluted runoff, such as detention or retention basins.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that delineate flood hazard zones for communities. The project site is designated by FIRM Community Panel Number 06067C0064J as being located within an area designated as Zone X (FEMA 2021). This zone is applied to areas of 0.2 percent annual chance flood; areas of 1 percent annual chance flood with average depths of less than one foot, or with drainage areas less than one square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1 percent annual chance flood. The project site is in an area protected from the one percent annual chance (100-year) flood by levee, dike, or other structures subject to possible failure or overtopping during larger storms. FEMA does not have building regulations for development in areas designated Zone X and would not require mandatory flood insurance for structures.

Section 13.08.145 of the Sacramento City Code (Mitigation of drainage impacts; design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities) requires that when a property would contribute drainage to the storm drain system or combined sewer system, all stormwater and surface runoff drainage impacts resulting from the improvement or development must be fully mitigated to ensure that the improvement or development does not affect the function of the storm drain system or combined sewer system, and that an increase in flooding or in water surface elevation that adversely affects individuals, streets, structures, infrastructure, or property does not occur.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.7 of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater, and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts 4.7-1, 4.7-2), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 4.7-3). Policies included in the 2035 General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation (Policies ER 1.1.2, EC 2.1.1), comprehensive flood management (Policy EC 2.1.23), and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Policy ER 1.1.1 to ER 1.1.10) were identified that the Master EIR concluded would reduce all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

Construction

Ground disturbance during construction of the proposed project would create the potential to degrade water quality from increased sedimentation and increased discharge (increased flow and volume of runoff) associated with stormwater runoff. Disturbance of site soils would increase the potential for erosion from stormwater to occur. The SWRCB adopted a statewide NPDES Construction General Permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2012-0006-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The proposed project would include ground disturbance exceeding one acre; and, thus, would be subject to the foregoing regulations.

The City's SQIP contains a Construction Element that guides implementation of the NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. This General Construction Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP should contain a site map(s) which shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, stormwater collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project. The SWPPP must list BMPs the discharger will use to protect stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program; a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutant to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Section A of the Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP. Compliance with City requirements to protect stormwater inlets would require the developer to implement BMPs such as the use of straw bales, sandbags, gravel traps, and filters; erosion control measures such as vegetation and physical stabilization; and sediment control measure such as fences, dams, barriers, berms, traps, and basins. City staff inspects and enforces the erosion, sediment, and pollution control requirements in accordance with Sacramento City Code 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.

Conformance with City regulations and permit requirements along with implementation of BMPs would ensure that construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to water quality.

Operations

The project would consist of a two-story repair facility, truck and trailer parking area, all-vehicle parking area, and landscaping throughout the 2.38-acre site. The majority of the site would be covered by impervious surfaces. This would decrease storm water absorption, and increase storm water discharge and flows, with the potential to violate water quality standards associated with urban runoff (nonpoint source pollutants) to storm drains.

As a standard Condition of Approval (COA) for development projects in the City, the City's Department of Utilities requires preparation and submittal of project-specific drainage studies. With submittal of the required drainage study, the Department of Utilities would review the Improvement Plans for the proposed project prior to approval to ensure that adequate water quality control facilities are incorporated. It should be noted that the proposed project would comply with Section 13.08.145, Mitigation of drainage impacts; design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities, of the City of Sacramento Code, which requires the following:

When a property that contributes drainage to the storm drain system or combined sewer system is improved or developed, all stormwater and surface runoff drainage impacts resulting from the improvement or development shall be fully mitigated to ensure that the improvement or development does not affect the function of the storm drain system or combined sewer system, and that there is no increase in flooding or in water surface elevation that adversely affects individuals, streets, structures, infrastructure, or property.

Because the proposed project would conform with City requirements and implement appropriate BMPs during both construction and operations, the proposed project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question B

A floodplain is an area that is inundated during a flood event and is often physically discernable as a broad, flat area created by historical floods. According to FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is located within Zone X. Zone X is an area of minimal flood hazard and characterized as an area with reduced risk due to levee. FEMA does not have building regulations for development in areas designated Zone X and would not require mandatory flood insurance for structures in Zone X. The project site is not within 50 feet of a levee, therefore would not be subject to levee setback limitations (General Plan Policy EC 2.1.7), nor would it obstruct access to levees (General Plan Policy EC 2.1.13). Additionally, the General Plan includes Policy EC 2.1.3 that ensures funding to meet a minimum level of 200-year regional flood protection is obtained as quickly as possible. Future development is required to comply with Policies EC 2.1.2, EC 2.1.3, EC 2.1.14 which require the City to maintain eligibility under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and cooperate with regional flood planning efforts and update the City's Floodplain Management Plan.

In addition, localized flooding caused by failure of the storm drainage system, which typically results in street flooding could occur as a result of the proposed project due to increased storm water runoff. Implementation of General Plan Policy ER 1.1.5 requires that there be no net increase in storm water runoff peak flows over existing conditions associated with a 100-year storm event. Implementation of General Plan Policy U 4.1.5 requires new development proponents to submit drainage studies that adhere to City storm water design requirements and incorporate measures to prevent on- or offsite flooding (Sacramento City Code Title 13, Chapter 13.08, Article III(A)). Therefore, conformance with City regulations and permit requirements would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None Required.

FINDINGS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Noise Metrics

All noise-level and sound-level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A-weighting, abbreviated "dBA," to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time averaged noise levels of one hour are expressed by the symbol "L_{EQ}" unless a different time period is specified. Maximum noise levels are expressed by the symbol "L_{MAX}." Some of the data also may be presented as octave-band-filtered and/or A octave band-filtered data, which are a series of sound spectra centered on each stated frequency, with half of the bandwidth above and half of the bandwidth below, the stated frequency. These data are typically used for machinery noise analysis and barrier-effectiveness calculations. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a 24-hour average, where noise levels during the evening hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. have an added 5 dBA weighting, and sound levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. have an added 10 dBA weighting. This is similar to the Day Night sound level (L_{DN}), which is a 24-hour average with an added 10 dBA weighting on the same nighttime hours but no added weighting on the evening hours.

Noise emission data are often provided based on the industry standard format of sound power (noted by S_{WL}), which represents the total acoustic power level radiated from a given sound source as related to a reference power level. Sound power differs from sound pressure (if notation is needed, the abbreviation is S_{PL}), which measures the fluctuations in air pressure caused by the presence of sound waves and is generally the format that describes noise levels as heard by the receiver. Sound pressure is the actual noise experienced by a human or registered by a sound level instrument. When sound pressure is used to describe a noise source, the distance from the noise source must be provided to provide complete information. Sound power is a specialized analytical method to provide information without the distance requirement, but it may be used to calculate the sound pressure at any desired distance.

Because decibels are logarithmic units, S_{PL} cannot be added or subtracted through standard arithmetic. Under the decibel scale, a doubling of sound energy corresponds to a 3 dBA increase. In other words, when two identical sources are each producing sound of the same loudness, the resulting sound level at a given distance would be 3 dBA higher than from one source under the same conditions. For example, if one automobile produces an S_{PL} of 70 dBA when it passes an observer, two cars passing simultaneously would not produce 140 dBA—rather, they would combine to produce 73 dBA. Under the decibel scale, three sources of equal loudness together produce a sound level 5 dBA louder than one source.

Under controlled conditions in an acoustical laboratory, the trained, healthy human ear is able to discern 1 dBA changes in sound levels, when exposed to steady, single-frequency ("pure-tone") signals in the mid-frequency (1,000 Hertz [Hz]–8,000 Hz) range. In typical noisy environments, changes in noise of 1 to 2 dBA are generally not perceptible. It is widely accepted, however, that people begin to detect sound level increases of 3 dB in typical noisy environments. Further, a 5 dBA increase is generally perceived as a distinctly noticeable increase, and a 10 dBA increase is generally perceived as a doubling of loudness.

Vibration Metrics

Groundborne vibration consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves transmitted through the ground with an average motion of zero. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena and anthropogenic causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous (e.g., factory machinery) or transient (e.g., explosions). Peak particle velocity (PPV) is commonly used to quantify vibration amplitude. The PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration wave. For the purposes of this analysis, a PPV descriptor with units of inches per second in/sec is used to evaluate construction-generated vibration for building damage and human complaints.

City of Sacramento Noise Standards

Sacramento Municipal Code

The following noise ordinances are potentially applicable to the project (City 2020):

Section 8.68.60 Exterior Noise Standards – establishes exterior noise standards for noise received by agricultural and residential properties of 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The ordinance allows the exterior standard to be exceeded by 5 dBA for cumulative periods of 15 minutes per hour, by 10 dBA for cumulative periods of 5 minutes per hour, by 15 dBA for cumulative periods of 1 minute per hour, and by 20 dBA maximum for any period.

Section 8.68.60 Interior Noise Standards – establishes residential interior noise limits during the period of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. of: 45 dBA for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour; 50 dBA for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; and 55 dBA for any period of time.

Section 8.68.80 Exemptions – exempts noise sources from the exterior noise requirements due to the erection (including excavation), demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday; provided, however, that the operation of an internal

combustion engine shall not be exempt pursuant to this subsection if such engine is not equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers which are in good working order.

City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan

The following General Plan policies are potentially applicable to the project (City 2015a):

Policy EC 3.1.1 – establishes normally acceptable noise levels of 60 dBA L_{DN} for residential—low-density single-family land uses; 70 dBA for office buildings—business, commercial and professional; and 75 dBA L_{DN} for industrial, manufacturing, utilities, and agriculture uses.

Policy EC 3.1.2 – establishes standards for acceptable increases to existing ambient levels due to development projects. Table EC 2 from the 2035 General Plan is reproduced here as Table 6, *Exterior Incremental Noise Impact Standards for Noise-Sensitive Uses (dBA).*

Table 6
Exterior Incremental Noise Impact Standards for Noise-Sensitive Uses

Existing L_{DN} (dBA)	Allowable Noise Increment (dBA)
Residences and buildings where people normally sleep	
45	8
50	5
55	3
60	2
65	1
70	1
75	0
80	0
Institutional land uses with primarily daytime and evening uses	
45	12
50	9
55	6
60	5
65	3
70	3

Existing L_{DN} (dBA)	Allowable Noise Increment (dBA)
75	1
80	0

Source: City of Sacramento 2015a.

Policy EC 3.1.8 – require mixed-use, commercial, and industrial projects to mitigate operational noise impacts to adjoining sensitive uses when operational noise thresholds are exceeded.

Policy EC 3.1.10 – requires development projects subject to discretionary approval to assess potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses and to minimize impacts on these uses, to the extent feasible.

Existing Conditions

Noise Sensitive and Surrounding Land Uses

Noise-sensitive land uses (NSLU) are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors (receivers) are individual locations that may be affected by noise. The closest NSLUs to the project site are single-family residences located directly across Morrison Avenue to the south of the project site. boundary to the south. Lots east, west (across Opportunity Street), and north (across Harris Avenue) of the project site have a general plan land use designation of Employment Center Low Rise and are developed with commercial/industrial uses, including a truck rental business to the west and a truck sales/service business to the north (Figure 2).

Existing Noise Sources

Existing noise in the vicinity of the project site is dominated by traffic noise from Interstate 80 (I-80), approximately 1,060-feet north of the project site. Additional traffic noise comes from Harris Avenue, Opportunity Street, and Morrison Avenue, adjacent to the project site. Other noise in the project vicinity includes truck circulation and truck servicing noise from the businesses west and north of the project site and building mechanical systems and parking lot noise from the commercial building on the eastside of the project site. The project site is also subject to periodic noise from aircraft approaching and departing Sacramento International Airport (approximately 8-miles to the northwest) and McClellan Airport (approximately 3.6-miles northeast).

General Site Survey

One long-term (24 hours; LT-1) and three short-term (15 minutes; ST-1, ST-2, ST-3) ambient noise measurements were conducted during a site visit on August 17 and 18, 2021. Site LT-1 is located on a utility pole on the southern edge of the project site along Morrison Avenue. Site ST-1 is located on the southern edge of the project site along Morrison Avenue. Site ST-2 is located on the northern edge of the project site along Harris Avenue. Site ST-3 is located on the west side of Norwood Avenue between I-80 and Harris Avenue. The 24-hour measurement was conducted between August 17th and 18th, 2021, with the meter attached to a utility pole approximately 8-feet above the ground. All of the 15-minute measurements were conducted on August 17, 2021 with the meter mounted on a tripod and positioned 5-feet above the ground. The measurement locations are shown on Figure 2. Traffic counts were conducted during the short-term measurements. The measured noise levels and related weather conditions for the measurements are shown in Table 7, *Noise Measurement Results*.

Table 7
Noise Measurement Results

Measurement	Location	Conditions	Time	Level	Notes
LT-1	Utility pole on Morrison Avenue, approximately 336 feet west of Opportunity Street	At start: 80°F, 9 miles per hour (mph) wind, 39 percent humidity, sunny	8/18/2021 10:00 a.m. 8/17/2021 to 10:00 a.m.	61.6 dBA L_{DN}; 65.0 dBA highest 1-hr L_{EQ}	Meter on utility pole, approximately 8 feet above ground level.
ST-1	Sidewalk north side of Morrison Avenue, approximately 265 feet east of Opportunity Street	80°F, 9 mph wind, 39 percent humidity, sunny	8/17/2021 10:12 a.m. to 10:27 a.m.	49.3 dBA L_{EQ}	1 aircraft departing Sacramento International Airport. 1 car, 0 trucks.
ST-2	Sidewalk south side of Harris Avenue, approximately 300 feet east of Opportunity Street	81°F, 9 mph wind, 33 percent humidity, sunny	8/17/2021 10:34 a.m. to 10:49 a.m.	58.4 dBA L_{EQ}	2 aircraft departing Sacramento International Airport. 12 cars, 5 medium trucks and 2 heavy trucks.
ST-3	West side of Norwood Avenue, approximately 290 feet north of Harris Avenue	83°F, 8 mph wind, 31 percent humidity, sunny	8/17/2021 10:56 a.m. to 11:04 p.m.	70.3 dBA L_{EQ}	294 cars, 17 medium trucks and 7 heavy trucks.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

In addition to the above standards, the allowable incremental increase in exterior noise established in the 2035 General Plan Policy EC 3.1.2 (shown in Table 5, above) would apply.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2035 General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail, and stationary sources. The General Plan policies establish exterior (Policy EC 3.1.1) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the General Plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial, and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.10, which calls for the City to assess potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses and to minimize impacts on these uses. Notwithstanding application of the General Plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 4.8-1) and interior noise levels (Impact 4.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 4.8-4) were found to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the Master EIR which would reduce the severity of significant noise and vibration impacts. All other noise and vibration impacts were found to be less than significant and would require no mitigation (City of Sacramento 2014; City of Sacramento 2015b).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable; no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact.

On-Site Operational Noise

Non-transportation (on-site) noise sources associated with operation of the project would include rooftop HVAC systems, air compressors, pneumatic impact wrenches, tire removal/installation machines, tire bead setting machines, and truck circulation (including backup alarms).

On-site operational noise sources were modeled as described above. Receivers were placed along the property lines closest to the project site for the nine closest residences to the project site (across Morrison Avenue to the south), see Figure 2 in the Noise Vibration Assessment Report (HELIX 2021), included as Appendix E, for modeled receiver locations. The results of the modeling for the 1-hour L_{EQ} and L_{MAX} at each receiver location are compared to the City daytime standard (from the city Municipal Code section 8.68.60) in Table 8, *Operational On-Site Noise, L_{EQ} and L_{MAX}*.

Table 8
Operational On-Site Noise, L_{EQ} and L_{MAX}

Receiver	L_{EQ} (dBA)	L_{EQ} Standard (dBA)	Exceed L_{EQ} Standard?	L_{MAX} (dBA)	L_{MAX} Standard (dBA)	Exceed L_{MAX} Standard?
R1	49.0	55	No	64.3	75	No
R2	52.3	55	No	67.7	75	No
R3	53.3	55	No	68.8	75	No
R4	54.3	55	No	69.6	75	No
R5	54.5	55	No	69.3	75	No
R6	54.2	55	No	68.3	75	No
R7	51.7	55	No	65.3	75	No
R8	57.1	55	No	65.2	75	No
R9	47.3	55	No	62.8	75	No

Source: CadnaA (see Appendix E for model output).

As shown in Table 8, noise levels from combined onsite operational sources would not exceed the daytime L_{EQ} or L_{MAX} limits. The project is anticipated to have operating hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and the 50 dBA noise standard from the noise ordinance during the 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. hours would not apply.

Noise generated on the project site during cumulative periods of the noisiest hour was analyzed with the following assumptions: only the rooftop HVAC and the air compressor would operate for 30- or more minutes per hour; only the rooftop HVAC, air compressor, and pneumatic impact wrenches would operate for 15- or more minute per hour; and only the rooftop HVAC, air compressor, pneumatic impact wrenches, and truck circulation would operate for 5- or more minute per hour. The equipment operating for 1- or more minutes per hour would be the same as the equipment operating 5- or more minutes per hour and was not analyzed (the 1-minute standard is a higher noise level than the 5-minute standard). The results of the modeling for the 30-minute, 15-minute, and 5-minute cumulative periods at each receiver location are compared to the City daytime standard (from the City Municipal Code Section 8.68.60) in Table 9, *Operational On-Site Noise, Cumulative Periods (dBA)*.

Table 9
Operational On-Site Noise, Cumulative Periods (dBA)

Receiver	30-Min	30-Min Standard	Exceed Standard?	15-Min	15-Min Standard	Exceed Standard?	5-Min	5-Min Standard	Exceed Standard?
R1	20.0	55	No	35.60	60	No	47.30	65	No
R2	21.8	55	No	38.80	60	No	50.60	65	No
R3	22.4	55	No	40.00	60	No	51.70	65	No
R4	23.3	55	No	41.60	60	No	52.60	65	No
R5	24.3	55	No	43.30	60	No	52.90	65	No
R6	24.9	55	No	44.00	60	No	52.80	65	No
R7	24.6	55	No	38.40	60	No	50.70	65	No
R8	26.6	55	No	40.70	60	No	49.00	65	No
R9	12.5	55	No	28.20	60	No	45.70	65	No

Source: CadnaA (see Appendix E for model output).
min = minutes

As shown in Table 9, noise levels from combined onsite operational sources would not exceed the daytime cumulative period noise limits for residential receivers. The project would therefore not result in the generation of on-site operational noise exceeding City standards established in section 8.68.60 of the City Municipal Code.

Off-site Transportation Noise

Future traffic noise levels presented in this analysis are based on traffic volumes described above. In addition to the residential receiver along Morrison Avenue (R1 through R9), two receivers were placed along roadway segments with only commercial/industrial land uses: Receiver C-1 was placed along the commercial property line opposite the project site on Harris Avenue and receiver C-2 was placed along the property line for the government agency located west of Norwood Avenue. The traffic noise modeling accounts for terrain and road geometry does not account for noise reduction resulting from structures and barriers on or off the project site. The results of the traffic noise analysis are shown below in Table 10, *Off-site Traffic Noise Levels (dBA L_{DN})*. The increase in noise is compared to the allowable increase described in Table 7, above.

Table 10
Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels (dBA L_{DN})

Roadway Segment	Existing AM Peak Hour	Existing + Project PM Peak Hour	Increase	Allowable Increase	Exceed Allowable Increase?
Norwood Avenue – I-80 to Harris Avenue	71.3	71.4	0.1	3	No
Harris Avenue – Norwood Avenue to Opportunity Street	68.9	68.9	0	3	No
Morrison Avenue	66.7	66.7	0	1	No

Source: CadnaA (see Appendix E for model output).

As shown in Table 10, existing ambient noise levels exceed the City's normally acceptable standard of 60 dBA L_{DN} noise level limits for residential land uses along Morrison Avenue and 70 dBA for professional buildings along Norwood Avenue. However, the maximum noise increase as a result of the addition of project traffic would be 0.1 dBA L_{DN}. This increase would not be noticeable and would not exceed the 1 dBA L_{DN} maximum allowable increase for residential uses or the 3 dBA maximum allowable increase for commercial/professional uses. Therefore, transportation noise resulting from long-term operation of the project would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the General Plan.

Impact Conclusion

Operation of the project would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City General Plan or noise ordinance. The impact would be less than significant and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question B

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable; no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact (City of Sacramento 2014; City of Sacramento 2015b).

Traditional architectural materials typically used in residential construction attenuate noise levels by 15 dBA. Therefore, if the noise level at the exterior of the nearest NSLUs would exceed 60 dBA L_{DN}, the interior noise levels would exceed the City standard established in 2035 General Policy EC 3.1.3. The Exiting and Existing + Project scenario exterior noise levels for the residential receivers along Morrison Avenue (R1 through R9) are shown in Table 11, *Residential Change in Ambient Noise (dBA L_{DN}).*

Table 11
Residential Change in Ambient Noise (dBA L_{DN})

Receiver	Existing PM Peak Hour	Existing + Project PM Peak Hour	Increase
R1	66.5	66.5	0
R2	66.5	66.5	0
R3	66.6	66.6	0
R4	66.7	66.7	0
R5	66.7	66.7	0
R6	66.7	66.7	0
R7	66.7	66.7	0
R8	66.8	66.8	0
R9	66.8	66.8	0

Source: CadnaA

As shown in Table 11, the existing ambient exterior noise levels exceed the 60 dBA level which results in interior noise levels above the 45 dBA L_{DN} City standards. However, the addition of project traffic would not result in a noticeable increase in residential exterior or interior noise levels. This impact would be less than significant and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question C

The nearest NSLUs to the project site area are approximately 75-feet south of areas anticipated to have significant construction activity. The noisiest heavy construction equipment anticipated to be used near NSLUs would be a dozer, used during site preparations. Modeling with the RCNM shows that noise from a dozer would be 74.2 dBA L_{EQ} at the closest residential property line. This noise level would exceed the City Noise Ordinance standard of 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

According to the City Code Section 8.68.060, *Exemptions*, noise sources associated with construction of the project which are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, are exempt for the City noise standard provided that all internal combustion engines used in the construction activities are equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers in good working order (City of Sacramento 2020). Project-specific Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would restrict construction hours to the above limitations and require all construction equipment to be equipped with intake and exhaust silencers.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, construction of the project would not result in exterior noise levels exceeding the City standard and all additional significant environmental effects would be mitigated to a ***less than significant level.***

Question D

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable, no mitigation was identified which would reduce the severity of the impact (City of Sacramento 2014; City of Sacramento 2015b).

Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving or blasting, would not be conducted by the project. A possible source of vibration during project construction activities would be a vibratory roller, which may be used within 25-feet of the nearest off-site building (commercial) to the east. A large vibratory roller would create approximately 0.210-inch per second PPV at a distance of 25-feet (Caltrans 2020). This vibration level would not exceed the 0.5-inches per second PPV threshold risk of architectural damage to non-engineered timber and masonry buildings. Therefore, although a vibratory roller may be perceptible to nearby human receptors, impacts associated with construction vibration impacts would be less than significant and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question E

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (City of Sacramento 2014; City of Sacramento 2015b).

The project does not propose new highways or railroads and there are no existing highways or railroads within 1,000-feet of the project site. The project would not affect operations on any railroads and the project would not add a substantial amount of truck trips (maximum of 16 truck trips per day) to highways in the City. Therefore, the project would not result in ground-borne vibration in excess of 0.5-inch per second PPV from highway traffic or rail operations and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question F

The General Plan Master EIR found this impact to be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (City of Sacramento 2014; City of Sacramento 2015b).

Buildings older than 45-years (built before 1976) have the potential to be listed as historically significant in California. Several of the residences across Morrison Avenue from the project site were built prior to 1977. The closest potentially historic building to the project site is a residence constructed around 1920, approximately 90-feet from the project site. A large vibratory roller could create approximately 0.210-inch per second PPV at 25-feet (Caltrans 2020). With typical ground conditions, a large vibratory roller at 90-ft would result in 0.05-inches per second PPV.[b] This vibration level would not exceed the 0.2-inches per second PPV threshold risk of architectural damage to historical buildings. The project would not propose new highways, and there are no highways within 1,000-feet of the identified potentially historic buildings. Therefore, impacts related vibrations from project construction or project affected highways would be less than significant and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction Hourly Limits

The applicant shall ensure that construction activities are consistent with City Code Section 8.68.060. The City shall note on all construction permits that any project construction activities that may result in the generation of noise shall not occur outside of the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, and outside of the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. on Sunday, and that all internal combustion engines used for project construction shall be equipped with intake and exhaust silencers and maintained in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's specifications.

Findings

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Noise can be mitigated to a **less than significant leve**l.

[b] $PPV = PPV_{REF} (D_{REF}/D)^N$ where PPV_{REF} = the reference vibration level, D_{REF} = the refence distance, D = the distance from the vibration source to the receiver, and N = 1.1 for typical soils (Caltrans 2020).

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
10. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento, approximately 5-miles north of the downtown core of the City, and is served with fire protection, police protection, and parks by the City of Sacramento.

Fire

SFD provides fire protection services to the entire city and some small areas just outside the City boundaries. SFD provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project site. First-response service is provided by Station 18, located at 746 N Market Boulevard, a 2.5-mile drive northwest of the project site.

Police

Policy protection services are provided by the Sacramento Police Department (SPD) for areas within the City. The SPD provides law enforcement protection to the proposed project site from the SPD located at 3550 Marysville Boulevard, approximately 2-miles east of the project site.

Schools and Libraries

The project site is located within the Sacramento City Unified School District and is 7-miles northwest of California State University, Sacramento. The project site is located in an area served by urban levels of library services.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on various public services. These include police, fire protection, schools, libraries, and emergency services (Chapter 4.10).

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

General plan policies that call for the City to consider impacts of new development on schools (see, for example, Policy ERC 1.1.2 setting forth locational criteria, and Policy ERC 1.1.4 that encourages joint-use development of facilities) reduce impacts on schools to a less-than-significant level. (Impacts 4.10-3, 4) Impacts on library facilities were considered less than significant (Impact 4.10-5).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

According to the Master EIR, implementation of the 2035 General Plan public service policies by individual projects would ensure that adequate public services are available in the City of Sacramento as development and population increase. The proposed project would be consistent with the type and intensity of development anticipated for the site in the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, based on the analysis in the Master EIR, the proposed project would not impact public services, nor would the proposed project require the development of facilities beyond what is anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

The SPD provides law enforcement protection to the project site from the station located at 3550 Marysville Road. According to the Master EIR, the SPD currently has adequate staffing and response times to serve the proposed project during construction activities and operation. Surrounding residential, commercial, and industrial development is currently served by the SPD and the proposed project would include generally similar uses. Thus, the project would not substantially increase the need for police services beyond what has been previously anticipated in the 2035 General Plan and analyzed in the Master EIR.

The project site is served by the SFD from Station 18, located at 746 N Market Boulevard, a 2.5-mile drive northwest of the project site. According to the Master EIR, the SFD currently has staffing and response times to adequately serve the proposed project site. The proposed project would include the addition of a two-story repair facility, truck and trailer parking area, and landscaping throughout. The project would not include the development of residential units that would increase population in the service area of the SFD. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to pay development fees for fire protection service for City of Sacramento fire services. Based on the type of development that would occur as part of the project, new fire stations would not be required to be developed nor would existing fire stations need to be expanded.

Considering the information above, the proposed project would not generate new residents in an area that would require law enforcement and fire service facilities to be expanded or new facilities to be built beyond what is described in the Master EIR. The proposed project would not directly generate new students in the area; therefore, existing educational facilities would not need to be expanded nor would new facilities need to be developed. The proposed project would not generate residents that would increase the use of the Sacramento Public Library system. Therefore, existing library facilities would not need to be expanded nor would new facilities need to be built to accommodate implementation of the proposed project. Thus, increased demand on public services resulting from implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with what was planned for in the 2035 General Plan and analyzed in the Master EIR. The proposed project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
11. RECREATION Would the project: A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?			X
B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Department of Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment (YPCE) maintains and manages most parks and recreational facilities within the City of Sacramento. The YPCE Department classifies parks according to three distinct types: 1) neighborhood parks; 2) community parks; and 3) regional parks. Neighborhood parks are typically less than 10-acres in size and are intended to be used primarily by residents within a half-mile radius. Community parks are generally 10 to 60-acres and serve an area of approximately two- to three-miles, encompassing several neighborhoods and meeting the requirements of a large portion of the City. Regional parks are larger in size and include additional improvements not usually found in local neighborhood and community parks. The City currently contains 230 developed and undeveloped park sites and approximately 4,829 -acres of open space, off-street bikeways and trails, sports fields, recreation facilities, and park amenities.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities; or,
- create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.9 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2035 General Plan on the City's existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities, and recreational services. The general plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal ERC 2.1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees, or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities (Policy ERC 2.2.5). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies. (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2)

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Questions A and B

The Master EIR analyzed potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities with implementation of future projects, including the proposed project. Policies were included in the 2035 General Plan to ensure that future residential and non-residential development would not impact existing parks and recreational

facilities and to ensure that adequate park and recreational facilities are provided to the residents of Sacramento. The Master EIR concluded that, with implementation of the policies in the 2035 General Plan, future development would not have a significant impact on park and recreational facilities. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designations of the 2035 General Plan, and, as a result, increased demand on parks and recreational facilities from development of the project were generally anticipated in the Master EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not accelerate substantial deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities, nor would the proposed project require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a two-story repair facility that would be used to store and fix vehicles. The project would not include the development of residential units and would, therefore, not generate an increase in residents that would use parks and recreational facilities in the City. The project includes 23,400-sf of landscaping around and within the project site. Landscaping includes ornamental and native trees, shrubs, and ground cover plants. In addition, the project would not cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities or create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

Considering that the proposed project would not result in a project-specific impact related to recreation, the proposed project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

NONE REQUIRED.

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
12. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION Would the project: A) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			X
B) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X
C) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
D) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is bounded by Harris Avenue to the north; existing light-industrial buildings to the east; Morrison Avenue to the south; and Opportunity Street to the west. Harris Avenue, Morrison Avenue, and Opportunity Street are all categorized as local streets, which provide direct roadway access to abutting land uses and serve short distance trips within neighborhoods.

The proposed project consists of the construction of a two-story repair facility with an administrative and office building, and three attached repair bays. Additionally, the project is proposing two concrete aprons, truck and trailer parking area, vehicle parking area, and landscaping around and within the project site. The project site would include one main 45-feet access driveway on the north side of the project site, off of Harris Avenue.

The truck and trailer parking area would include 32 parking spaces, each with a 45-foot radius for rotation. The parking spaces would be split in half, with half placed 78-feet from the other half to allow for rotation and circulation. The all-vehicle parking in the project site would include 25 spaces, with two being ADA compliant, and four being EVO compliant. The all-vehicle parking area would have labeled employee parking spaces versus visitor parking spaces. Employee parking would include 8 parking spaces. One parking space located adjacent to the entrance to the administrative and office building would be used for loading. A sidewalk would be located adjacent to the main vehicle access driveway. This sidewalk would wrap around the northern, eastern, and western sides of the two-story repair facility, with access to the public entrance on the eastern side of the facility. There would be an ADA approved auto self-closing and auto locking gate at the entrance of the site from the sidewalk. Just outside the ADA approved gate, there would be 8 bicycle parking spaces. The project site would be paved to allow for on-site facilities and vehicles.

The proposed project is expected to generate a very limited amount of truck traffic in the project vicinity. According to traffic counts conducted by the City, Morrison Avenue has an ADT of 872 vehicles in the project vicinity (City of Sacramento 2021).

Policy M of the 2035 General Plan Update calls for the City to implement a flexible, context-sensitive level of service (LOS) standard that allows the City to establish variable LOS thresholds appropriate for the unique characteristics of the City's diverse neighborhoods and communities. The City strives to operate the roadway network at LOS D or better for vehicles during typical weekday AM and PM peak-hour conditions

with exceptions where LOS E or LOS F are allowed. LOS D is considered the standard for areas outside of multi-modal districts, which would include the vicinity of the proposed project. The Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan identified roadways at LOS E and F. Neither of the streets immediately adjacent to the proposed project have high enough traffic volume to have been evaluated for LOS as part of the Master EIR. None of the roadways in the vicinity of the proposed project are at LOS E or F.

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to transportation and circulation are considered significant if the proposed project would do any of the following:

• Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; or,

• Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); or,

• Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or,

• Result in inadequate emergency access.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 4.12. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and aviation components. Provisions of the 2035 General Plan that provide substantial guidance include Mobility Goal 1.1, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated and maintained, promotion of multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1), support for state highway expansion and management consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SACOG MTP/SCS) (Policy M 1.5.6) and development that encourages walking and biking (Policy LU 4.2.1).

While the general plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, the Master EIR concluded that the general plan development would result in significant and unavoidable effects. See Impacts 4.12-3 (roadway segments in adjacent communities, and Impact 4.12-4 (freeway segments).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The proposed project is consistent with the type and intensity of development described in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan, which found that build out of the General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable effects. The project is proposing to employ six people and service 5 to 8 trucks per day and is projected to generate a total of 32 one-way trips per day. The trips assume automobiles and light trucks for worker trips, heavy duty trucks for client trips, and medium duty trucks for vendor trips. According to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Work Tour VMT Map, employment-generating projects have a threshold of achieving a 15% of reduction in the regional average work VMT per Job. Work VMT per job is calculated by tallying all work VMTs, including work VMT made by both internal and external workers traveling to work, divided by the total jobs (SCAG 2021). The Work Tour VMT Map shows the proposed project site has a Work VMT per Job ratio of 85-100% of the Regional Average (SCAG 2021). The project includes construction of a sidewalk access to the facility which would provide enhanced pedestrian access to the project site. Construction activities would be temporary and do not involve roadway improvements which would require lane closures. No delays or impacts to traffic circulation during construction are anticipated.

Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce any new inconsistency with the applicable plans, policies, and ordinances and there would be ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question B

SB 743, which enacted PRC Section 21099, required changes to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. The City approved a General Plan Update which includes SB 743 and using VMT as a metric for evaluating transportation impacts of proposed projects under CEQA.

If a transportation project would likely lead to a measurable and substantial increase in vehicle travel (i.e., increase total VMT), it is presumed to be a significant impact and an analysis assessing the amount of vehicle travel the project would induce shall be conducted. However, the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (OPR 2018) states that projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. The proposed project is expected to generate fewer trips than the threshold used by OPR, with an estimated maximum of 32 one-way vehicle trips per day. Therefore, there would be ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question C

The land use and intensity of the proposed project is consistent with the land uses anticipated in the 2035 General Plan and would not introduce hazards due to incompatible uses. As previously discussed, the project site has been designated as employment center (low rise) in the 2035 General Plan and is zoned for light industrial use. The development of a truck terminal repair facility is consistent with the land uses and zoning designations for the project site and would not introduce incompatible uses or associated hazards.

The site design of the proposed project allows trucks to enter or exit via a paved driveway on the north side of the project site, off of Harris Avenue. This new access point would result in turning movements in and out of the project site which would increase the potential for interaction with through traffic along the adjoining roads; however, the project driveway would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be subject to prior design review and approval by the City Public Works Department. Therefore, the development of the truck terminal repair facility would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and there would be ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question D

The proposed project would not modify streets currently used for emergency access or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The proposed project is consistent with the type and intensity of development evaluated in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR. The proposed project is anticipated to generate a very small amount of traffic, with 32 one-way vehicle trips per day entering and leaving the site. This minimal increase in traffic would not interfere with emergency response; therefore, ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
13. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is: i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources code section 5020.1(k) or		X	
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X	

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

For thousands of years, the Sacramento area has been occupied by Native American groups. Tribal cultural resources, including human burials, have been found throughout the city. Areas of high sensitivity for tribal cultural resources are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses.

This section analyzes and evaluates the potential impacts of the project on Tribal cultural resources, both identified and undiscovered. Tribal cultural resources, as defined by Assembly Bill (AB) 52, Statutes of 2014, in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074, are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects, with cultural value to a Tribe. A Tribal cultural landscape is defined as a geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.

The unanticipated find of Native American human remains would also be considered a Tribal cultural resource, and are therefore analyzed in this section.

The proposed project area is situated within the lands traditionally occupied by the Valley Nisenan, or Southern Maidu. Many descendants of Valley Nisenan throughout the larger Sacramento region belong to the United Auburn Indian Community, Shingle Springs, Ione Band, Colfax-Todds Valley, and Wilton Rancheria Tribes. The Tribes actively participate in the identification, evaluation, preservation, and restoration of Tribal Cultural Resources.

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) is a federally recognized Tribe comprised of both Miwok and Maidu (Nisenan) Tribal members who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The Tribe has a deep spiritual, cultural, and physical ties to their ancestral land and are contemporary stewards of their culture and landscapes. The Tribal community represents a continuity and endurance of their ancestors by maintaining their connection to their history and culture. It is the Tribe's goal to ensure the preservation and continuance of their cultural heritage for current and future generations.

Data Sources/Methodology

Under PRC section 21080.3.1 and 21082.3, the City must consult with tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area that have requested formal notification and responded with a request for consultation. The parties must consult in good faith. Consultation is deemed concluded when the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource when one is present or when a party concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. Mitigation measures agreed on during the consultation process must be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document.

On September 22, 2021, HELIX requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File (SLF) for the presence of Native American sacred sites of human remains in the vicinity of the APE. A written response from the NAHC on November 1, 2021, stated that the results of the SLF search were positive. On November 2, 2021, HELIX sent letters to 14 Native American contracts that recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of information related to cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area (Appendix D). As of November 12, 2021, no responses have been received from any of the contracts.

In response to the City's notification of the project to UAIC, UAIC conducted a records search for the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources for this project which included a review of pertinent literature and historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the California Historic Resources Information System Center (CHRIS) as well as historic resources and survey data.

Native American Consultation

On June 2, 2021 formal invitations to participate in AB 52 consultation on the proposed project were sent by the City to four tribes that have previously requested to receive notifications of proposed projects. These representatives included:

- Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
- United Auburn Indian Community
- Buena Vista Band of Me-Wuk Indians
- Wilton Rancheria

United Auburn Indian Community requested a consultation on June 11, 2021. The consultation request was closed on August 6, 2021 with the stipulation that an unanticipated discovery mitigation measure would be included, and that a post ground disturbance site visit would be conducted with a Tribal representative present. Wilton Rancheria and Shingle Spring Band of Miwok Indians did not request a consultation within the 30-day period. Buena Vista Band of Me-Wuk Indians declined consultation on this project.

Regulatory Setting

Federal

There are no Federal plans, policies, or regulations related to Tribal Cultural Resources that are directly applicable to the proposed project, however Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does require consultation with Native Americans to identify and consider certain types of cultural resources. Cultural resources of Native American origin identified as a result of the identification efforts conducted under Section 106 may also qualify as tribal cultural resources under CEQA.

State

California Environmental Quality Act — Statute and Guidelines. CEQA requires that public agencies that finance or approve public or private projects must assess the effects of the project on tribal cultural resources. Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is (1) listed or determined eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or a local register, or (2) that are determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

California Public Resources Code Section 5024. PRC Section 5024.1 establishes the CRHR, which is the authoritative guide for identifying the State's historical resources to indicate what properties are to be protected, if feasible, from substantial adverse change. For a resource to be eligible for the CRHR, it must be more than 50 years old, retain its historic integrity, and satisfy one or more of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, a tribal cultural resource is considered to be a significant resource if the resource is: 1) listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources; or 2) the resource has been determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts on tribal cultural resources may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed project would result in the following:

- cause a substantial change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources (see Master EIR Chapter 4.4 and Appendix C – Background Report, B. Cultural Resources Appendix), but did not specifically address tribal cultural resources because that resource type had not yet been defined in CEQA at the time the Master EIR was adopted. The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historic resources and archaeological resources, some of which could be tribal cultural resources as defined Public Resources Code 21074. Ground-disturbing activities

resulting from implementation of development under the 2035 General Plan could affect the integrity of an archaeological site (which may be a tribal cultural resource), thereby causing a substantial change in the significance of the resource. General plan policies identified as reducing such effects on cultural resources that may also be tribal cultural resources include identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1); implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2); consultation with appropriate organizations and individuals including the Native American Heritage Commission and implementation of their consultation guidelines (Policy HCR 2.1.3); enforcement programs to promote the maintenance, rehabilitation, preservation, and interpretation of the City's historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.4); listing of qualified historic resources under appropriate national, State, and local registers (Policy HCR 2.1.5); consideration of historic and cultural resources in planning studies (Policy HCR 2.1.6); enforcement of compliance with local, State, and federal historic and cultural preservation requirements (Policy HCR 2.1.8); and early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10).

Of particular relevance to this project are policies that ensure compliance with protocol that protect or mitigate impacts to archaeological resources (Policy HCR 2.1.16) and that encourage preservation and minimization of impacts on cultural resources (Policy HCR 2.1.17).

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None. As noted above, the Master EIR did not specifically address tribal cultural resources but did address archaeological resources and other cultural resources and noted that because the presence of significant archaeological resources is typically unknown until the resource is uncovered, which often occurs during ground disturbing activities, adverse effects may occur prior to discovery of the archaeological resources. Therefore, although laws and regulations combined with General Plan policy would substantially reduce impacts to these resources once they are discovered, the initial impacts that might occur prior to discovery would be considered potentially significant and that protection of all important archaeological resources from damage or destruction cannot be assured.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A Parts I and II

Although no evidence has been provided by the Tribes that TCRs are present in the project site and the thresholds under PRC Section 21704(a)(1) have not been met, there is the potential for ground disturbing activities to expose previously undiscovered TCRs or human remains. If present, project activities could result in a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1a - c (in addition to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2) is required. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures to address any unanticipated discoveries to TCRs, the proposed project's potential impacts to unknown TCRs would be ***less than significant***.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure TCR-1a: Conduct Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training Program Prior to Ground-Disturbing Activities

> The City shall require the applicant/contractor to provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with culturally affiliated Native American tribes.. The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations.
>
> The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what

to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1b: In the Event that Cultural Resources or Tribal Cultural Resources Are Discovered During Construction, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Impacts and Procedures to Evaluate Resources.

If cultural resources or tribal cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100-feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project's City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- Planning construction to avoid tribal cultural resources, archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space, or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.

- Recommendations for avoidance of cultural resources and tribal cultural resources will be reviewed by the City representative, interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid cultural resources or tribal cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to cultural resources or tribal cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource or tribal cultural resource.

- Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes will be consulted on the analyses and shall have the opportunity to meet with the City representative and its representatives who have technical expertise to identify and recommend feasible avoidance and design alternatives, so that appropriate and feasible avoidance and design alternatives can be identified.

- If the discovered cultural resource or tribal cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. The boundary of a cultural resource or a tribal cultural resource will be determined in consultation with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.

- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an "Environmentally Sensitive Area".

If a cultural resource or a tribal cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of cultural resources or tribal cultural resources:

- Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources- (CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.

If a cultural resource or a tribal cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City and with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that respond to the City's invitation. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall consult with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record. For any recommendations made by interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that are not implemented, a justification for why the recommendation was not followed will be provided in the project record.

Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American Tribes and the City representative will also consult to develop measures for long-term management of any discovered tribal cultural resources. Consultation will be limited to actions consistent with the jurisdiction of the City and taking into account ownership of the subject property. To the extent that the City has jurisdiction, routine operation and maintenance within tribal cultural resources retaining tribal cultural integrity shall be consistent with the avoidance and minimization standards identified in this mitigation measure.

If the City determines that the project may cause a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to the resource. These measures may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less-than significant may be reached:

- Avoid and preserve resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.

- Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Protect the cultural character and integrity of the resource.

- Protect the traditional use of the resource.

- Protect the confidentiality of the resource.

- Establish permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places.

- Protect the resource.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1c: Implement Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during project-related construction activities or project planning, the City the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48-hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24-hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner's findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains. The responsibilities of the City for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1d: Post Disturbance Site Visit (UAIC)

A minimum of seven days prior to beginning earthwork, clearing and grubbing, or other soil disturbing activities, the applicant/contractor shall notify lead agency and United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the proposed earthwork start-date. A UAIC Tribal Representative shall be invited to inspect the project site, including any soil piles, trenches, or other disturbed areas, within the first five days of groundbreaking activity, or as appropriate for the type and size of project,. During this inspection, a UAIC Tribal Representative may provide an on-site meeting for construction personnel information on TCRs and workers awareness brochure.

If any TCRs are encountered during this initial inspection, or during any subsequent construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find and the measures included in the Inadvertent/Unanticipated Discoveries Mitigation Measure shall be implemented. Preservation in place is the preferred alternative under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort must be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize significant effects to the resources, including the use of a paid Native American Monitor during ground disturbing activities.

FINDINGS

With the implementation of the mitigation measures above, impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Water Supply

Water service for the project would be provided by the City of Sacramento. The City provides domestic water service from a combination of surface water and groundwater sources: the American River, Sacramento River, and groundwater wells (pumped from the North and South American Subbasins). Water from the American River and Sacramento River is diverted by two water treatment plants: the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant (SRWTP), located at the southern end of Bercut Drive approximately 6-miles southwest of the project site, and the E.A. Fairbairn Water Treatment Plant (FWTP), located at the northeast corner of State University Drive South and College Town Drive approximately 9-miles southeast of the project site. The FWTP and the SRWTP divert water from the American and Sacramento rivers, respectively. Water diverted from the Sacramento and American Rivers is treated, stored in storage reservoirs, and pumped to customers via a conveyance network.

The City of Sacramento complies with the California Water Code, which requires urban water suppliers to prepare and adopt Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years. The most recent UWMP was adopted in 2020 and includes an analysis of water demand sufficiency under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios. Water supply and demand projections include future planned development under the 2035 General Plan. Based, in part, on these projections, the City possesses sufficient water supply entitlements and treatment capacity during normal, dry, and multiple dry years to meet the demands of its customers up to the year 2035. It is important to note that this assumes that wells and surface water treatment capacity will be rehabilitated and expanded as needed (City of Sacramento 2020).

Wastewater

The Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provide wastewater and treatment services for the area in which the project site is located. The City of Sacramento provides wastewater collection for approximately two-thirds of the area within the City limits. Wastewater generated in the vicinity of the project site is collected in the County's system through a series of sewer pipes and pump stations or through gravity flow. Once collected in the County's system, sewage flows into the SRCSD interceptor system, where the sewage is conveyed to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. The SASD is responsible for providing sewage service to the project site. The City's Department of Utilities is responsible for providing and maintaining water, storm drainage, and flood control services for residents and businesses within the City limits.

Stormwater

The City's separate storm drainage system includes conveyance of storm water and dry weather urban runoff to the adjacent creeks and rivers. The separate drainage system consists of street drains, conveyance systems, and usually a pump station to discharge into either a Sacramento or American River. These discharges are regulated for water quality by the Regional Water Quality Control Board NPDES permit.

Solid Waste Disposal

Commercial solid waste materials collected by the Solid Waste Division of the City Public Works Department are sorted at either the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station (owned by BLT Enterprise) or the North Area Transfer Station, owned by the County of Sacramento Public Works Department; City waste transported from the City's transfer stations is then transported to Lockwood Landfill in Lockwood, Nevada. The City of Sacramento General Plan MEIR indicates that the City landfills have sufficient capacity for full buildout of the 2035 General Plan.

Electricity and Natural Gas

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is responsible for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical power to its 900 square mile service area, which includes most of Sacramento County and a small portion of Placer County. SMUD buys and sells energy and capacity on a short-term basis to meet load requirements and reduce costs. The Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) provides natural gas service to residents and businesses within the City of Sacramento.

A utility line is located on site but will require a relocation.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to utilities and service systems beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan:

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on water supply, sewer and storm drainage, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications. See Chapter 4.11.

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2035 General Plan. Policies in the general plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 4.11-1) but the Master EIR concluded that the potential increase in demand for potable water in excess of the City's existing diversion and treatment capacity, and which could require construction of new water supply facilities, would result in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 4.11-2). The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a less-than-significant effect (Impact 4.11-4). Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant (Impact 4.11-5). Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less-than-significant level.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

Water Supply

The proposed project is the development of a two-story truck repair facility with an administrative and office building, and three attached repair bays. Additionally, the project is proposing two concrete aprons, truck and trailer parking area, all vehicle parking area, and landscape around and within the project site. Total maximum occupancy for the two-story repair facility is 44 occupants. Given that the 2020 UWMP for the City projects the annual water per capita demand for year 2020 to be 225-gallons per capita per day (gpcd) (City of Sacramento 2020), the project could require a maximum 9,900-gallons of water per day (225-gallons per capita per day x 44 occupants). The total projected water use is 1,134-gallons per day, and watering duration would occur either once or twice a week.

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The 2020 UWMP considered these projections and effects of a single dry year and a five-year drought at any period between 2025 and 2045. The City's drought risk was specifically assessed between 2021 and 2025, assuming that the next five years are dry years. In each case, water supplies comfortably exceed water demands. This remains true whether the drought occurs in 2021, 2045, or any year between. Thus, the project would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Wastewater and Stormwater

Total maximum occupancy for the two-story repair facility is 44 occupants. Using the population-based flow factor identified in Section 4.11, Public Utilities, of the MEIR of 132-gallons per capita per day, the project would result in an increased demand of a maximum of 5,826-gallons per day (132-gallons per capita per day x 44 occupants). This flow was accounted for in the 2035 General Plan and MEIR; therefore, this impact would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Solid Waste

The City's 2035 General Plan MEIR provides solid waste generation rates for residential and employment (retail, office, industrial uses). For employment use, the solid waste generation is 10.8-pounds per employee per day.

As described in Question A and B, the total maximum occupancy for the two-story repair facility is 44 occupants. The maximum solid waste for all occupants would generate 475-pounds per day of waste (10.8-pounds per employee per day x 44 occupants). This would equate to maximum 173,448-pounds or 87-tons per year of waste from employees at the facility. Additionally, Because the project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, this solid waste production would not exhaust the remaining landfill capacity and this impact would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Construction of the project would result in increased use of electricity and natural gas to support the proposed project facilities. Both utility providers would install new distribution facilities, as needed, according to California Public Utilities Commission rules. Because the increased demand in energy is evaluated in the 2035 General Plan MEIR, and because PG&E and SMUD would ensure their capability of providing an adequate level of service to the project site, this impact would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question B

As part of the project, new onsite and offsite underground utilities would be constructed. Potential environmental effects associated with the construction of these facilities are generally discussed throughout this Initial Study in various sections including: air quality (during construction), cultural resources, hazards, noise, and traffic. With implementation of the mitigation measures listed in this document, impacts related to the construction of new utilities would result in ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

NONE REQUIRED.

FINDINGS

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
15. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE 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 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
C.) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

With implementation of project-specific mitigation measures discussed in previous sections of this IS/MND, the proposed project would not adversely impact sensitive natural communities or special-status animals. However, a small potential exists for previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources and/or human remains to be unearthed during demolition and site grading activities.

With implementation of the mitigation measures required by this IS/MND in Sections 2. Biology, 3. Cultural Resources, 9. Noise, and 13. Tribal Cultural Resources, compliance with 2035 General Plan policies, and application of standard BMPs during construction, development of the proposed project would not result in any of the following: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce or impact the habitat of fish or wildlife species; 3) cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or, 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project's impact would be less than significant and ***no additional significant environmental effects*** would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

Question B

While the project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and region, these impacts have previously been evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City's General Plan as set forth in this Initial Study. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts: The site is located within an industrial area in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento and is surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development. The site is a vacant lot that is in a relatively disturbed condition. No sensitive plants have the potential to occur on the project site and there were no reported or observed occurrences of special status animal species. However, the site provides suitable habitat for the White-Tailed Kite, Burrowing owl, Swainson's Hawk, and other common nesting raptors and migratory birds. The nearest extant occurrence of the burrowing owl is 0.4 miles southwest of the site; however, rural/ disturbed areas, such as the project site, provide marginally suitable habitat for burrowing owls. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1**, potential impacts related to burrowing owls would be less than significant.

Swainson's Hawk and White-Tailed Kite generally nest in larger trees. Although none were observed on site, Swainson's Hawk was reported within a 5-mile radius of the site, and the White-Tailed Kite was observed 1.3 miles northwest of the site. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-2**, potential impacts to Swainson's Hawk and White-Tailed Kite would be reduced to a less than significant level. Migratory and none-game birds are protected during nesting season by California Fish and Game Code. A variety of migratory birds have the potential to nest in the project site. Project construction or activity during avian breeding season (February 1 – August 31) could directly or indirectly impact eggs and chicks. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-3**, impacts to migratory birds would be reduced to a less than significant level. Four trees are present on the project site and would need to be moved for the development of the project. **Mitigation Measure BIO-4** reduces impacts relating to protected trees prior to any ground disturbance, mitigating the future tree removal on site to a less than significant level.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through4**, impacts related to biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative cultural resources impacts: The records search determined that three studies have previously been conducted within 0.25-mile of the APE, but the APE itself has not been surveyed for cultural resources. No resources have previously been documented within the APE's boundaries. A review of NAHC's Sacred Lands File returned a positive result, and HELIX sent letters to 14 Native American contracts that recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of local information related to cultural resources. HELIX Archaeologist Jentin Joe conducted a pedestrian survey of the APE on October 1, 2021. Ground visibility during the survey was moderate due to dense grass within the APE, and no cultural resources were found during the survey.

Although no evidence of cultural resources of significance were noted on project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative noise impacts: The nearest NSLUs to the project site area are approximately 75 feet south of areas anticipated to have significant construction activity. The noisiest heavy construction equipment anticipated to be used near NSLUs would be a dozer, used during site preparations. Modeling with the RCNM shows that noise from a dozer would be 74.2 dBA L_{EQ} at the closest residential property line. This noise level would exceed the City Noise Ordinance standard of 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

According to the City Code Section 8.68.060, *Exemptions*, noise sources associated with construction of the project which are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday, Tuesday,

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, are exempt for the City noise standard provided that all internal combustion engines used in the construction activities are equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers in good working order (City of Sacramento 2020). Project-specific **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** would restrict construction hours to the above limitations and require all construction equipment to be equipped with intake and exhaust silencers.

Therefore, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**, construction of the project would not result in exterior noise levels exceeding the City standard and all additional significant environmental effects would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural impacts: The City of Sacramento sent project notification letters to four California Native American tribes. Although there is no evidence of TCRs occurring or having the potential to occur on the project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-1a-1c**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

Question C

As described in this IS/MND, implementation of the proposed project could result in impacts to biological resources, tribal and cultural resources, and noise prior to the implementation of mitigation measures. In addition to the project specific mitigation measures within this IS/MND, the proposed project would be required to implement all applicable policies of the 2035 General Plan. Implementation of all such mitigation measures and policies would reduce any potential direct or indirect impacts that could occur to human beings or various resources and all impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, the proposed project's impact would be ***less than significant*** and ***no additional significant*** environmental effects would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

On the basis of the initial study:

I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2035 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the project as appropriate, and additional feasible mitigation measures and alternatives will be incorporated to revise the proposed project before the negative declaration is circulated for public review, to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b))

Ron Bess

Signature

August 12, 2022

Date

Ron Bess

Printed Name

A	Agriculture
AB	Assembly Bill
APE	Area of Potential Effects
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CALgreen	California Green Building Code
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBSC	California Building Standards Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
City	City of Sacramento
CO	carbon monoxide
CO2	carbon dioxide
COA	Condition of Approval
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
dBA	decibels A
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DSH	Diameter at Standard Height
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency

EPAct	The Energy Policy Act of 1992
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Areas
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FWTP	E.A. Fairbairn Water Treatment Plant
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HazMat	Hazardous Materials
HSC	Health & Safety Code
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MEIR	Master Environmental Impact Report
MLD	Most-Likely Deceased
MM	Mitigation Measure
M-1S	Light-Industrial
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NO2	nitrogen dioxide
NOx	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWPR	Navigable Waters Protection Rule
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OHWM	ordinary high-water mark
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric
PM10	Particulate Matter, 10 um
PM2.5	Particulate Matter, 2.5 um
PRC	Public Resources Code
RACM	Regulated Asbestos-Containing Material
ROG	reactive organic gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAA	Streambed Alternation Agreement

SACOG MTP/SCS	Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
SAFE	Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles
SASD	Sacramento Area Sewer District
SB	Senate Bill
Sf	square foot
SFD	Sacramento Fire Department
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SO2	sulfur dioxide
SPD	Sacramento Police Department
SQIP	Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan
SRCSD	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
SRWTP	Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TRUs	Truck Refrigeration Units
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds
WEAP	Worker Environmental Awareness Program
WOTUS	Waters of the U.S.
WQC	Water Quality Control
YPCE	Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment

REFERENCES CITED

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2021. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0. Available at: http://www.caleemod.com/.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2021a. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health. Accessed June 2021.

2021b. EMFAC2021 v1.03, Online Emissions Inventory Tool. Available at: https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/emissions-inventory/.

2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. January. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

2015. Risk Management Guidance for Stationary Sources of Air Toxics. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/rma/rmgssat.pdf.

2014. First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.

2008. Climate Change Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change. December. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2008-scoping-plan-documents.

2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 1994. State Fish and Game staff report regarding mitigation for impacts to Swainson's hawks in the Central Valley of California. November.
2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.

2021. California Natural Diversity Database (For: *Rio Linda, Carmichael, Sacramento East, and Citrus Heights* USGS 7.5-minute series quadrangles), Sacramento, CA. Accessed September 17, 2021.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. April. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf.

2019. Traffic Census Program. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/census.

2018. *California State Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available at: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983. Accessed October 4, 2021.

2009. Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS). November.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2016. *California Important Farmland Finder.* Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/. Accessed October 4, 2021.

2021a. *Seismic Hazards Mapping Act.* Available at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/hazards/seismic-hazards-mapping-act. Accessed October 4, 2021.

2021b. *EQZApp*. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed October 4, 2021.

2021c. Tsunami Hazard Map. Available at: (link). Accessed October 4, 2021.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2019. *2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan*. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/filebrowser/download/1900. Accessed October 5, 2021

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2021. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-03 0.39). For: *Rio Linda, Carmichael, Sacramento East, and Citrus Heights* USGS 7.5-minute series quadrangles), Sacramento, CA. Accessed September 17, 2021.

Carrier. 2008. 50PG03-28 Product Data. Available at: http://www.aireclima.com/carrier/pdf/50PG-5PD.pdf.

CEC and California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2003. *Reducing California's Petroleum Dependence*. Available at: https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/fuels/carefinery/ab2076final.pdf. Accessed October 5, 2021

City of Sacramento (City) 1995. City of Sacramento Traffic Counts. Available at: http://www.cityofsacramento.org/public-works/transportation/traffic-data-maps/traffic-counts.

2014. Draft Master Environmental Impact Report for the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update. August. Available at: http://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Environmental-Impact-Reports/2035-GP-Update/Public-Draft-MEIR081114.pdf?la=en.

2015a: *2035 General Plan*. Available at: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Environmental-Impact-Reports/2035-GP-Update/2035-GPU-FinalMEIR_02242015.pdf?la=en. Accessed October 4, 2021

2015b. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Available at: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Environmental-Impact-Reports/2035-GP-Update/2035-GPU-FinalMEIR_02242015.pdf?la=en. Accessed October4, 2021.

2015c. Climate Action Plan Consistency Review Checklist. June 19. Available at: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/CAP-Consistency-Checklist_2030-Gen-Plan-6-19-15.pdf?la=en.

2020. Sacramento City Code, Chapter 8.68, Noise Control. Available at: https://www.qcode.us/codes/sacramento/.

2020. *Urban Water Management Plan.* Available at: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/DOU/Reports/R---038---City-of-Sacramento-Draft-2020-UWMP---05-18-21.pdf?la=en. Accessed October 4, 2021.

2021. Traffic Counts. Available at https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Traffic-Data-Maps/Traffic-Counts. Accessed December 13, 2021.

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. EnviroStor. Retrieved October 4, 2021, from https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&city=Sacramento&zip=95838&county=Sacramento&case_number=&business_name=&FEDERAL_SUPERFUND=True&STATE_RESPONSE=True&VOLUNTARY_CLEANUP=True&SCHOOL_CLEANUP=True&CORRECTIVE_ACTION=True&tiered_permit=True&evaluation=True&operating=True&post_closure=True&non_operating=True&inspections=True.

Estep, J.A. 1989. Biology, movements, and habitat relationships of the Swainson's hawk in the Central Valley of California, 1986-1987. California Department of Fish and Game, Wildlife Management Division, Nongame Bird and Mammal Section, Sacramento, CA.

2009. The influence of vegetation structure on Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) foraging habitat suitability in Yolo County, CA. Yolo County Habitat/Natural Community Conservation Plan.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2021. National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL). Available at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=121%20Morrison%20Avenue%2C%20Sacramento#searchresultsanchor. Accessed October 4, 2021.

Iowa Environmental Mesonet. 2019. Sacramento Executive Airport Wind Rose Plot. Available at: https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/sites/windrose.phtml?station=SAC&network=CA_ASOS.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. February. Available at: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/wg1/.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2015. 2016 National Hydric Soils List. December 2015. Available on-line at: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/use/hydric/.

2021. Web Soil Survey. Available online at: https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed September 17, 2021.

2020. Web Soil Survey. Available online at: https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm. Accessed October 4, 2021.

NETR Online. 2021. Historical Aerials. Accessed online October 4, 2021 at: https://www.historicaerials.com/

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/air/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

Ogden International. 1986. Road Travel Survey.

Palmer, R.S. 1988. Handbook of North American birds. Vol. 4: diurnal raptors. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, CT.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2021. Work Tour VMT Map. Available at: https://sb743-sacog.opendata.arcgis.com/

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2021. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. Accessed October 4, 2021. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/Residents/CEQA-Land-Use-Planning/CEQA-Guidance-Tools.

2019. AERMOD meteorological data files. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/businesses/ceqa-land-use-planning/ceqa-guidance-tools.
2017. Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. July. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/Sac%20Regional%202008%20NAAQS%20Attainment%20and%20RFP%20Plan.pdf.

1977. Rule 403 Fugitive Dust. August 3. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/rule403.pdf.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). 2015. Update to District's Risk Management Policy to Address OEHHA's Revised Risk Assessment Guidance Document. Available at: https://www.valleyair.org/busind/pto/staff-report-5-28-15.pdf.

Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SHTAC). 2000, May 31. Recommended timing and methodology for Swainson's hawk nesting surveys in California's Central Valley.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. *GeoTracker*. Retrieved October 4, 2021, from https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Sacramento.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1999. *San Joaquin Series*. Available at: https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/OSD_Docs/S/SAN_JOAQUIN.html. Accessed October 4, 2021.

U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2008. Roadway Construction Noise Model version 1.1. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/.

2004. Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/traffic_noise_model/tnm_v25/.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2021. Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC). List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location and/or be affected by your proposed project.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. *Superfund National Priorities List*. Available at: https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33cebcdfdd1b4c3a8b51d416956c41f1. Accessed October 4, 2021

2011. Haul Road Workgroup Recommendations. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-10/documents/haul_road_workgroup-final_report_package-20120302.pdf.

Willson-Kerns, Cory. 2019. Noise Exposure and Evaluation at tire Changing Facilities, Colorado State University Department of Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences.

Zeiner, D.C., W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr., K.E. Mayer, and M. White, eds. 1988-1990. California's Wildlife. Vol. I-III. California Depart. of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.