



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:

Trucking Terminal Yard Project (DR20-035) – The proposed project would create a truck terminal to be used for overnight parking and storage of trucks with sleeper cabs and 53-foot trailers. Vehicles would typically be parked overnight and on weekends, with trucks entering the project site in the evening and exiting the site in the morning.

The proposed project, located on an approximately a 3.6-acre vacant site bounded by Santa Ana Avenue and Dry Creek Road in the North Sacramento area of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County with a Truck Terminal Yard with driveways and parking on the property identified as APN 215-0280-055 in the City of Sacramento.

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:

Date: March 11, 2021



**TRUCKING TERMINAL YARD PROJECT
(DR20-035)**

**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 [PRC] 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 Environmental Impact Report (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.

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I BACKGROUND.....	5
II PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	7
III ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION.....	10
1. Aesthetics	12
2. Air Quality	15
3. Biological Resources	27
4. Cultural Resources	43
5. Energy	49
6. Geology and Soils	53
7. Hazards	56
8. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	59
9. Noise.....	63
10. Public Services	68
11. Recreation	70
12. Transportation and Circulation	72
13. Tribal Cultural Resources	76
14. Utilities and Service Systems	84
15. Mandatory Findings of Significance	86
IV ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....	88
V DETERMINATION	89
REFERENCES CITED.....	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A Air Quality Modeling Data
- B Biological and Wetland Resources Evaluation Report
- C Noise Modeling Data

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Follows Page</u>
1	Vicinity Map.....	8
2	Land Use and Zoning.....	8
3	Site Plan.....	8

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Sources and Health Effects of Criteria Air Pollutants	17
2	Sacramento County Attainment Status.....	18
3	Trees Located on the Project Site.....	35

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQ	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DSH	Diameter at Standard Height
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Areas
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MM	Mitigation Measure
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

NCIC	North Central Information Center
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
PRC	Public Resources Code
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAA	Streambed Alternation Agreement
SB	Senate Bill
SFD	Sacramento Fire Department
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SPD	Sacramento Police Department
SQIP	Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TRUs	Truck Refrigeration Units
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds
WOTUS	Waters of the U.S.
WQC	Water Quality Control

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

Project Name and File Number: Trucking Terminal Yard Project (DR20-035)

Project Location: Southeast corner of Santa Ana Avenue and Dry Creek Road
(APN 215-0280-055)

Project Applicant: Sukhpreet Dosanjh
7843 Black Sand Way
Antelope, CA 95843

Project Planner: Armando Lopez, Assistant Planner

Environmental Planner: Ron Bess, Associate Planner

Date Initial Study Completed: March 17, 2021

This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (PRC 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 that it 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 this Initial Study to review the 2035 General Plan Master EIR's discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects to determine their adequacy for the proposed project (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and to 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 mitigation monitoring plan for the 2035 General Plan, which provides references to applicable general plan policies that reduce the environmental effects of development that may occur consistent with the general plan, is included in the adopting resolution for the Master EIR (see City Council Resolution No. 2015-0060, beginning on page 60). The resolution is available at:

<http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx>

This analysis incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the 2035 General Plan Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The Master EIR is available for public review at the City of Sacramento's web site at:

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

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 April 16, 2021.

Please send written responses (preferably by email) to:

Ron Bess
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
Direct Line: (916) 808-8272
FAX (916) 808-1077
rbess@cityofsacramento.org

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

The Trucking Terminal Yard Project (proposed project) proposes to develop a vacant site at the corner of Santa Ana Avenue and Dry Creek with a truck terminal yard with a driveway and parking on the parcel identified as APN 215-0280-055 in the City of Sacramento.

PROJECT LOCATION

The subject property (project site) is located in the 1200 block of Santa Ana Avenue between Dry Creek Road and Raley Boulevard, southeast of the intersection of Santa Ana Avenue with Dry Creek Road, in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento (Figure 1, Vicinity Map). The 3.6-acre project site consists of APN 215-0280-055 and the approximate center of the property is at latitude 38.657989 and longitude - 121.437523, NAD 83.

The project site is designated Employment Center Low-Rise (ECLR) in the City's 2035 General Plan and is zoned Light Industrial (M-1S-R). The trucking terminal is allowed by right in the M-1S-R zone. The site is located in an industrial and rural residential area (Figure 2, Land Use and Zoning). The project site is located in an area zoned for industrial use, and the adjacent parcels to the north, east, and south are zoned for industrial use as well. The parcels to the west of the project are zoned for residential use. However, there are currently residences on parcels zoned for industrial use to the north and south of the project site.

The project site extends to the centerlines of Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue. Other than the paved roadways, the site is currently undeveloped and is in a relatively disturbed condition. Remnant fencing occurs along the project site boundary and within the site. Historic aerial imagery indicates that the property has been subject to a variety of reoccurring ground disturbance activities since 1947, including disking and staging of materials (NETR 2020). The present contours of the property reflect a history of fill, grading, and other modifications resulting in tire ruts, graded areas, and a gravel parking area which currently make up the microtopography of the property. An existing drainage ditch follows the south side of Santa Ana Avenue in the northwest portion of the project site. An existing sewer cleanout is located in the southwest portion of the site. Wetland areas are present in the northern, eastern, and southern portions of the property, as shown on Figure 3, Site Plan.

Topography of the site is largely flat, with small depressions containing aquatic resources. Elevation of the project site ranges from 39 to 42 feet above mean sea level.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would create a truck terminal to be used for overnight parking and storage of trucks with sleeper cabs and 53-foot trailers. Vehicles would typically be parked overnight and on weekends, with trucks entering the project site in the evening and exiting the site in the morning. Any trucks with refrigeration capabilities would not be running refrigeration units overnight. No buildings, including restroom facilities, would be constructed as part of the project. No signage is proposed.

Site Preparation

Grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb an approximately 1.6-acre (approximately 70,000-square-foot) area of the site, which is less than half of the site.

Parking Area

The proposed project consists of the construction of a 1.6 acre (approximately 70,000-square-foot) paved truck terminal yard with a driveway and parking stalls for up to 36 trucks. Each parking stall would be approximately 68.5 feet long by 10.8 feet wide.

Access and Circulation

The proposed project would include one driveway. One paved two-way driveway located on the southwest corner of the site would allow ingress and egress to Dry Creek Road. The driveway would be 45 feet wide where it meets Dry Creek Road and would taper to 25 feet wide at the project site interior. Gates at the driveway would control access to the site. Rows of parking spaces would have approximately 100 feet between rows, and aisles would be at least 25 feet wide.

28.5 and 31.5-foot-wide rights-of-way (ROW) for Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue would be dedicated to the City along the western and northern project site boundaries (respectively). Five-foot-wide sidewalks would be constructed within the ROWs for both roads.

Natural Areas, Landscaping, and Drainage

The site plan has been designed to avoid the existing wetland areas on the northern, eastern, and southern portions of the project site. The proposed project would include approximately 10,300 square feet of landscaping at the edges of the site surrounding the wetlands, which would remain undisturbed. Planter areas approximately 6.5 feet wide would be included in the ROWs between the sidewalk and the edge of pavement for Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue.

New drainage ditches along Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue would connect with the existing drainage ditch in the northwest portion of the project site. A storm water detention and water quality basin in the eastern portion of the site would connect with the existing wetland in that area.

Fencing

The truck terminal yard would be surrounded by a security fence and include new landscaping between the fence and surrounding streets (Figure 3, Site Plan). Existing fencing would be removed along the northern and western edges of the project site and existing fencing would remain along the eastern edge of the project site. New security fencing would be added along the edge of the paved areas in the northern and western portions of the site and along the southern property boundary. Gates would be added at the driveway.

Lighting

Lighting is not provided at the existing project site, but security lighting will be included as part of the project. The truck terminal yard will include lighting as recommended by the Sacramento Police Department per the following conditions:

- Exterior lighting shall be white light using LED lamps with full cutoff fixtures to limit glare and light trespass. Color temperature shall be between 2700K and 4100K with a color rendering index of 80 or higher and a light loss factor of .95 or better. When choosing lamps, the applicant shall look for efficiency of 110 lumens per watt or better. All existing exterior fixtures shall be replaced with fixtures that meet this requirement.
- Light poles, if applicable, shall be no higher than 25'.
- Broken or damaged exterior lighting shall be repaired or replaced within 48 hours of being noted.

- Entry drives, drive aisles, parking and bicycle parking shall be illuminated to a maintained minimum of 1.5-foot candles per square foot of parking area at a 6:1 average to minimum ratio.
- Exterior walkways, alcoves and passageways shall be illuminated to a maintained minimum of 1/3 foot candles per square foot of surface area at a 6:1 average to minimum ratio.
- Exterior lighting distribution and fixtures shall be approved by the Sacramento Police Department CPTED Sergeant (or designee) prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Exterior lighting shall be designed in coordination with the landscaping plan to minimize interference between the light standards and required illumination and the landscape trees and required shading.
- Exterior lighting shall be shielded or otherwise designed to avoid spill-over illumination to adjacent streets and properties.

Construction Schedule

Construction is anticipated to commence in Spring 2021 and would take approximately 3-4 weeks to complete.

Project Approvals

The proposed project would require the following approvals by the lead agency (i.e., the City of Sacramento):

- Grading Permit
- Site Plan and Design Review

Attachments

Appendix A – Air Quality Modeling Data

Appendix B - Biological and Wetland Resources Evaluation Report

Appendix C – Noise Modeling Data

SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Introduction

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 community's 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 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 it is zoned M-1(S)-R Light Industrial Zone. The project site is currently vacant and is located in an urbanized area of the City. All parcels that share a border with the project site have been developed, and while the project site itself has not yet been developed, it has been disturbed by human activity. 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. The proposed project would create a truck terminal yard on the project site, which is one of the uses permitted by right in the M-1(S) Light Industrial Zone. There would be no impact on existing and planned land uses.

Agricultural Resources

The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development on agricultural resources under the 2035 General Plan (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 would be 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 site is not zoned for agricultural uses, and 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.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project is located on Santa Ana Avenue between Dry Creek Road and Raley Boulevard in an industrial and residential area in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento. The project is bordered by Dry Creek Road to the west and Santa Ana Avenue to the north. The parcels to the west of the project across Dry Creek Road are zoned for residential use. The project site is located in an area zoned for industrial use, and the adjacent parcels to the north, east, and south are zoned for industrial use as well. However, there are currently residences on parcels zoned for industrial use to the north and south of the project. The site is currently vacant and regularly disked for weed abatement.

Public views of the project site include views from motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling on Dry Creek Road along the western side of the project and on Santa Ana Avenue along the northern side of the project site. Private views of the site would include those from single-family homes to the west, north, and south of the project site. 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).

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to aesthetics are based on Appendix G of the 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 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, new street lighting, parking lot lights, and headlights from vehicular traffic. Sensitive land uses would generally be residential uses, especially single- and multi-family residential uses. As such, the single-family development located to the west 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 and east of the project site. Such sources would likely include vehicle headlights from trucks entering or exiting the project site and glare from reflective surfaces such as vehicle windshields. The project site would include security lighting which would follow City of Sacramento standards and be designed to avoid spill-over illumination to adjacent streets and properties. No structures that would be potential sources of glare are proposed as part of the project site.

Based on the above, while the proposed project has the potential to introduce new sources of light from security lighting on the project site 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 significant 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. As described in the cultural resources section below, no historic resources are located on the project site or in the vicinity of the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to changing the visual character of such resources.

The project site is currently vacant and has been previously disturbed. Sacramento City Code Title 17 Planning and Development Code identifies the project site as being zoned for light industrial use. The proposed truck terminal yard is consistent with the permitted uses for the light industrial zone. The 2035 General Plan identifies land use of the project site and the parcels bordering it to the north, east, and south as employment center low-rise. The proposed project would be compatible with the existing 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.

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 significant environmental effects** beyond what was anticipated for the site in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

FINDINGS

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

TRUCKING TERMINAL YARD PROJECT (DR20-035)

INITIAL STUDY

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>2. <u>AIR QUALITY</u></p> <p><i>Would the proposal:</i></p>			
<p>A) Result in construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day?</p>			X
<p>B) Result in operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day?</p>			X
<p>C) Violate any air quality standard or have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>			X
<p>D) Result in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations that exceed SAMQMD requirements?</p>			X
<p>E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)?</p>			X
<p>F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>			X
<p>G) Result in TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources?</p>			X
<p>H) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), near the southern end. The SVAB consists of all or parts of eleven counties 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 site.

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 and a temperature inversion (areas of warm air overlying areas of cooler air) exist. 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. Typically, 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 exceedances of the federal and state air quality standards (SMAQMD 2020).

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 administers 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 (O₃); carbon monoxide (CO); coarse particulate matter (PM₁₀; particles 10 microns or less) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}; particles 2.5 microns or less); sulfur dioxide (SO₂); and lead (Pb). As permitted by the CAA, 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 [VOCs])^a, and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). PM₁₀ 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, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} can also be formed through chemical and photochemical reactions of precursor pollutants in the atmosphere. Common sources of the criteria air pollutants and their respective acute and chronic health impacts are described in Table 1.

^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
SOURCES AND HEALTH EFFECTS OF CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS**

Pollutant	Major Man-Made Sources	Human Health Effects
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	An odorless, colorless gas formed when carbon in fuel is not burned completely; a component of motor vehicle exhaust.	Reduces the ability of blood to deliver oxygen to vital tissues, affecting the cardiovascular and nervous system. Impairs vision, causes dizziness, and can lead to unconsciousness or death.
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	A reddish-brown gas formed during fuel combustion for motor vehicles and industrial sources. Sources include motor vehicles, electric utilities, and other sources that burn fuel.	Respiratory irritant; aggravates lung and heart problems. Precursor to ozone and acid rain. Contributes to climate change and nutrient overloading which deteriorates water quality. Causes brown discoloration of the atmosphere.
Ozone (O ₃)	Formed by a chemical reaction between reactive organic gases (ROGs) and nitrogen oxides (NO _x) in the presence of sunlight. Common sources of these precursor pollutants include motor vehicle exhaust, industrial emissions, gasoline storage and transport, solvents, paints, and landfills.	Irritates and causes inflammation of the mucous membranes and lung airways; causes wheezing, coughing, and pain when inhaling deeply; decreases lung capacity; aggravates lung and heart problems. Damages plants; reduces crop yield. Damages rubber, some textiles and dyes.
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5})	Produced by power plants, steel mills, chemical plants, unpaved roads and parking lots, wood-burning stoves and fireplaces, automobiles, and other sources.	Increased respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; aggravated asthma; development of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. Impairs visibility (haze).
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	A colorless, nonflammable gas formed when fuel containing sulfur is burned, when gasoline is extracted from oil, or when metal is extracted from ore. Examples are petroleum refineries, cement manufacturing, metal processing facilities, locomotives, and ships.	Respiratory irritant. Aggravates lung and heart problems. In the presence of moisture and oxygen, sulfur dioxide converts to sulfuric acid which can damage marble, iron, and steel. Damages crops and natural vegetation. Impairs visibility. Precursor to acid rain.
Lead	Metallic element emitted from metal refineries, smelters, battery manufacturers, iron, and steel producers, use of leaded fuels by racing and aircraft industries.	Anemia, high blood pressure, brain and kidney damage, neurological disorders, cancer, lowered IQ. Affects animals, plants, and aquatic ecosystems.

Source: California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) 2018

Existing Air Quality

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 2.

**Table 2
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 (NO 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 2020

As shown in Table 2, Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM₁₀ 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).

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) 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 2021). 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 2021).

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 receptor to the project site is a single-family residence adjacent the project site southern boundary. Additional sensitive receptors in the project vicinity include two single-family residences across Dry Creek Road to the west, and four single-family residences across Santa Ana Avenue to the north. The closest school to the project site is the Main Avenue Elementary School approximately 1,380 feet (0.26 mile) to the southeast.

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 (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). 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 (CO₂e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential (GWP). Expressing GHG emissions in CO₂e 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 CO₂ were being emitted. GHG emissions quantities in this analysis are presented in metric tons (MT) of CO₂e. 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): CO₂ – 1; CH₄ – 25; N₂O – 298.

GHG 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 primarily under the authority of the 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. EOs are not laws and only provide the governor's direction to state agencies to act within their authority to reinforce existing laws.

AB 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. Upon adoption of the 2035 General Plan, the 2012 CAP was rescinded, and the 2035 General Plan became the City's CAP. In updating the 2035 General Plan the City has met the State standards as a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions under Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

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 NO_x above 85 pounds per day;
- Operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Any increase in PM₁₀ concentrations, unless all feasible Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) 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 TAC. TAC exposure is deemed to be significant if:

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

A project is considered to have a significant effect relating to GHG emissions if it fails to satisfy the requirements of the City's CAP, as implemented in the City's 2035 General Plan.

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 CARB and the 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 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 GHG 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 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 GHG 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 address GHG emissions and climate change. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 4.14, and pages 4.14-1 et seq.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

Emissions of NO_x during project grading 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. According to the SMAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County, the development of projects that are 35 acres or less generally will not exceed the SMAQMD's construction NO_x thresholds of significance of 85 pounds per day and no quantitative estimate of project NO_x emissions would be required (SMAQMD 2020). The project site is approximately 3.6 acres and no unusually intensive construction activities would be required. 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 significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question B

Sources emissions of NO_x and ROG from long-term operation of the project would be exhaust from vehicles, exhaust from trailer refrigeration units (TRUs), exhaust from the occasional use of landscape maintenance equipment, and occasional ROG emissions from the use of solvents and degreasers and the reapplication of pavement markings for parking lot maintenance.

Criteria pollutant and precursor emissions for project operation were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2. CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and GHG emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California air districts. CalEEMod allows for the use of default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory) provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions, and/or user-defined inputs. The calculation methodology and default data used in the model are available in the CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendices A, D, and E (CAPCOA 2017). The modeling assumes approximately 75,000 SF of paved areas on the project site, estimated from the site plan (see Figure 3). According to the project applicant, up to 10 trucks per day would enter or exit the project site with the peak days on Mondays and Fridays. The modeling assumes that all trucks would be heavy duty and would divert from their hauling route on Interstate 5 (I-5) to and from the project site, approximately 6.5 miles each way. In addition, the modeling assumes that each truck trip would be accompanied by a car or light truck trip representing truck drivers commuting to and from the project site approximately 10 miles each way (the CalEEMod default worker commute distance for Sacramento County). The CalEEMod default values for the use of landscape equipment, consumer products (e.g., pavement solvents and degreasers), and the reapplication of pavement marking were used. The CalEEMod output files are included in Appendix A to this Initial Study.

The results of the modeling show that operation of the project would produce a maximum of 0.9 pound per day of NO_x and less than 0.1 pound 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 significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question C

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), PM₁₀ 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 significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question D

The project would result in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions during construction in the form of fugitive dust from earth moving 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, projects that are 35 acres or less in size generally will not exceed the SMAQMD's construction PM thresholds of significance. However, all construction projects regardless of the screening level 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 project site is approximately 3.6 acres and no unusually intensive construction activities would be required. Therefore, development of the project would not result in PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} emission that would exceed the SMAQMD thresholds.

The project would result in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions during operation in the form exhaust emissions, primarily from diesel powered on-road vehicles. The results of the modeling show that operation of the project would produce less than 0.1 pound per day of PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}, less than the thresholds of 80 pounds per day for PM₁₀ and 82 pounds per day for PM_{2.5}. These thresholds were developed by the SMAQMD to ensure that project-level emissions would not result in exceedance of the NAAQS and CAAQS concentration limits.

Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not result in emissions of PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} in excess of the SMAQMD requirements and the proposed project would have **no additional significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question E

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, "Other pollutants such as carbon monoxide (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-and-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 20 trucks and cars per day, the project is not anticipated to result in CO localized concentrations that exceed the CAAQS. The project would have **no additional significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question F

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

Question G

The only significant source of TACs during construction or operation of the project would be DPM from off-road equipment and on-road trucks. 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. Long term operation of the project would add up to 10 daily truck trips to the area roads which would not substantially increase health risks from exposure to TACs from mobile sources. Truck trailers with diesel-powered TRUs could be parked at the project overnight and on weekends with TRUs running. However, given the low volume of daily truck

traffic to the project site and the distance between the parking area and the closest sensitive receptor (approximately 75 feet) operation of the project would not result in substantially increased health risks due to prolonged exposure to concentrations of DPM. The project would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question H

As described in the Air Quality environmental setting discussion above, the City has integrated a CAP into the City's General Plan as a qualified plan for the reduction of GHG emissions under Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The significance of potential impacts related to climate change from development within the City is assessed based on the project's compliance with the City's adopted General Plan CAP Policies and Programs set forth in Appendix B of the 2035 General Plan. The majority of the policies and programs listed in Appendix B are citywide efforts that support a reduction of citywide emissions of GHG or are related to residential development and are not applicable to the proposed project because it does not propose any residential uses or buildings. The project's consistency with applicable General Plan CAP Policies and Programs that would reduce GHG emissions from buildout of the 2035 General Plan is discussed below.

Goal LU 2.5, City Connected and Accessible; Policies LU 2.5.1 and LU 2.5.2. These goals and policies require new development to maximize connections and minimizes barriers between neighborhoods corridors, and centers within the city. The project would not create barriers to public access between neighborhoods corridors, and centers within the city. The project would not conflict with these goals and policies.

Goal LU 2.7, City Form and Structure; Goal M 2.1, Integrated Pedestrian System; Policies LU 2.7.6 and M 2.1.2 and M 2.1.9. These goals and policies would create walkable, pedestrian-scaled blocks, and require sidewalks to be constructed in compliance with City design standards. The project would install new sidewalks in the public right of way (ROW) on the project's frontage with Santa Ana Avenue and Dry Creek road in conformance to City design standards.

Goal U 2.1, High-Quality and Reliable Water Supply; Policy U 2.1.15. These goals and policies promote and require water conservation strategies. The project would be required to comply with water-efficient and river-friendly landscaping in accordance with City and CAL Green and standards.

Goal U 4.1, Adequate Stormwater Drainage; Policy U 4.1.6. These goals and policies require adequate stormwater drainage facilities. The project would comply with City and Regional Water Quality Control Board standards for construction runoff control, bioretention areas and storm water drainage.

Goal ER 2.1, Natural and Open Space Protection; Policy ER 2.1.6. These goals and polices require the preservations of wetland resources, including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands, to the extent feasible. The project would preserve. Identified seasonal wetland features discussed in Section 3, Biological Resources, below.

Goal ER 6.1, Improved Air Quality; Policy ER 6.1.2. These goals and policies require projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for ROG, NOX, and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) through project design. As discussed, in Questions A, B, C, And D, above, the project would not result in emissions of ROG, NOX, or particulate matter in excess of the thresholds adopted by the City during construction or operation of the project.

Impact Conclusion

As shown in the above discussion of the City's General Plan CAP Policies and Programs, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's goals, policies, and programs listed in Appendix B or the 2035 General Plan, which was developed to enable the City to meet statewide GHG reduction mandates.

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
3. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u>			
Would the proposal:			
A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?			X
B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal 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.

Although 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.

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

Federal Requirements

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
- 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 IS/MND included a special-status species evaluation, an aquatic resources evaluation, and a biological and wetland reconnaissance survey, which included a tree inventory and the mapping of aquatic resources on the site.

Special-Status Species Evaluation

Special-status species are those that fall into one or more of the following categories, including those:

- listed as endangered or threatened under FESA (including candidates and species proposed for listing);
- listed as endangered or threatened under the 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 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 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 project site 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 proposed project site and vicinity from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS; USFWS 2020), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS; CNPS 2020), and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB; CDFW 2020).

Reconnaissance Survey

The biological resources and wetland reconnaissance survey was conducted on June 3, 2020 by HELIX biologists Patrick Martin and Stephanie McLaughlin, M.S., ISA Certified Arborist (WE-12922A). The project site was assessed for plant communities, habitat types, aquatic resources, and wildlife present at the time of the survey, and assessed for potential to support special-status species. The report detailing the findings of this survey, titled "Biological and Wetland Resources Evaluation Report for APN 215-0280-055 in the City of Sacramento, CA", can be found in Appendix B.

Project Setting

The site is located within an industrial and residential area in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento and is surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development. The project site is located in an area zoned for industrial use, and the adjacent parcels to the north, east, and south are zoned for industrial use as well. The parcels to the west of the project across Dry Creek Road are zoned for residential use. However, there are currently residences on parcels zoned for industrial use to the north and south of the project site.

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 2.56 acres, comprises the majority of the site. This habitat in the project site 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. Nearly all plant species observed during the site reconnaissance are non-natives associated with disturbance.

Aquatic Features

HELIX identified three potentially jurisdictional features totaling 0.51 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state: one seasonal pond (0.25 acre), and two wetland swales (0.26 acre). The swales are dominated by non-native species, including annual beardgrass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*) and Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*). The pond is dominated by toad rush (*Juncus bufonius*) and Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*) and appears to be used as a dumping ground for trash and other debris. All aquatic

features appear to be seasonally inundated and do not support suitable habitat for special-status species that require wetland or vernal pool habitat. All aquatic features appear to be manipulated natural features disturbed by filling and fed by rainfall and run-off from Santa Ana Avenue.

Wildlife Observations

Bird species observed in the vicinity of the project site include northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), California scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), western kingbird (*Tyrannus verticalis*), and turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*). These are common birds in urban and rural residential settings, and highly tolerant of human presence. In addition to the common species seen on site, a single adult Swainson's hawk was observed flying over the site during the biological reconnaissance survey. The hawk was chased off the site by a pair of American crows. Swainson's hawk is listed as Threatened under the CESA.

Special Status Species Evaluations

Evaluation of Regionally-Occurring Special-Status Plant Species

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 currently 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 CNDDDB. The site is vegetated with ruderal vegetation and has been disturbed. The wetland swales on the site are likely to be disturbed and ephemeral to provide habitat for these species, which require periods of inundation with saturation in the wetlands lasting until March or April (NatureServe 2016); aerial photographs show that the aquatic features on site are generally dry by March. Additionally, the pond is likely to be disturbed and polluted with roadside runoff and illegal dumping of waste to provide suitable habitat.

Evaluation of Regionally-Occurring Special-Status Animal Species

A total of 20 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. However, the site provides suitable habitat for Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and other nesting migratory birds. These species are discussed in greater detail in "Biological and Wetland Resources Evaluation Report for APN 215-0280-055 in the City of Sacramento, CA", found in Appendix B.

Evaluation of Nesting Birds

No bird nests were observed in the site. However, trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation in the site may provide nesting locations for a wide variety of common bird species. Activities in the project site resulting in ground disturbance during the avian breeding season (February through September) have potential to cause physical disturbance to active nests are present in or near the project site prior to such activities occurring.

Aquatic Resources

The project site is in the Lower Steelhead Creek hydrologic unit (HUC12: 180201110303); Steelhead Creek is a tributary to the Sacramento River. NWI mapping based on 1984 aerial imagery shows no aquatic features on the property. Historic aerial imagery shows the presence of swales running laterally across the site, as well as a pond in the northeastern corner of the site.

HELIX conducted a routine assessment of waters of the U.S. and State on June 3, 2020, generally in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0). A formal delineation of wetlands was not completed. HELIX identified three potentially jurisdictional features totaling 0.51 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state: one seasonal pond (0.25 acre), and two wetland swales (0.26 acre).

The swales are dominated by non-native species, including annual beardgrass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*) and Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*). The pond is dominated by toad rush (*Juncus bufonius*) and Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*) and appears to be used as a dumping ground for trash and other debris. All aquatic features appear to be seasonally inundated and do not support suitable habitat for special-status species that require wetland or vernal pool habitat. All aquatic features appear to be manipulated natural features disturbed by filling and fed by rainfall and run-off from Santa Ana Avenue.

Evaluation of Native Trees

Six trees are present on the site that include Gooding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*) and almond (*Prunus dulcis*). The City of Sacramento protects trees under Chapter 12.56 of the Sacramento City Code. A permit is required to remove native oaks, buckeyes, or sycamores having a 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. No trees have a cumulative DSH greater than 24 inches, thus no trees are considered protected by Sacramento City Code. See Table 3 for additional data on the trees found on the project site.

**Table 3
TREES LOCATED ON THE PROJECT SITE**

Tree Number	Species	DSH (inches), including total cumulative	Height (feet)	Condition	City Code Status
1	<i>Salix gooddingii</i> Goodding's black willow	9, 7.9, 8.2, 6.4 Total – 20.3	21	Good	Not Protected
2	<i>Salix gooddingii</i> Goodding's black willow	8.2, 7.8, 7.1, 6.5, 8.2 Total – 23	13	Good	Not Protected
3	<i>Salix gooddingii</i> Goodding's black willow	9.5, 9 Total – 4	19	Good	Not Protected
4	<i>Salix gooddingii</i> Goodding's black willow	7.2	6	Dead	Not Protected
5	<i>Salix gooddingii</i> Goodding's black willow	12.5, 13.1 Total – 19.4	14	Fair	Not Protected
6	<i>Prunus dulcis</i> almond	9, 5 Total – 11.5	14	Good	Not Protected

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
- 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 FESA (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing)
- Listed as endangered or threatened under CESA (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 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 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 CDFW, USFWS, 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 CESA, 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. CDFW regulates potential impacts on lakes, streams, and associated riparian (streamside or lakeside) vegetation through the issuance of SAAs 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 CWA 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 terminal yard with paved parking and one paved driveway, surrounded by landscaping and a security fence. 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

Three special status wildlife species have the potential to occur or be affected by the proposed project. These species include burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and white-tailed kite. In addition, raptors (including white-tailed kite) and other birds protected by the MBTA have the potential to occur and be impacted by the proposed project. Impacts to these species are discussed individually below. There are no sensitive plant species with the potential to occur in the project site. Impacts to the aquatic resources are discussed under Question C, below.

Burrowing Owl

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. The nearest extant occurrence of nesting is two miles west along Steelhead Creek (CDFW 2020).

Ruderal/disturbed areas in the project site provide marginally suitable habitat for burrowing owl. Previous disking and staging of materials have removed any small mammal burrows; however, there are several small debris piles that provide elements of suitable habitat. The site is too disturbed to support significant burrowing owl foraging and it 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 be present on the site.

If burrowing owls are residing in the project site, 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 implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 described below would reduce the potential of the proposed project to impact burrowing owl to a level of **less than significant**.

Swainson's Hawk

Swainson's hawk is a breeding season migrant in California that winters in South America; migrants typically arrive in mid-April and begin scouting nest locations. Breeding is finished by August and most birds have left the state by late-October. Populations are largest in the southern Sacramento Valley and high deserts. A year-round, resident population is present in Solano County.

Swainson's hawks typically nest in large trees in riparian woodlands, tall trees in upland stands 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. 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. 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.

The site is within the range of Swainson's hawk; however, the site is heavily disturbed and surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development and does not provide suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk. Swainson's hawk could occasionally forage in the site, but the site is too small to provide any significant foraging habitat and any Swainson's hawk using the site would be expected to use it only for temporary perching or foraging. However, suitable nesting habitat is present in tall trees adjacent to the site and higher quality foraging habitat is present in surrounding areas. Therefore, Swainson's hawk could potentially nest in trees adjacent to the site. The nearest extant reported occurrence of Swainson's hawk nesting in CNDDDB is 1.5 miles northwest along Dry Creek (CDFW 2020).

Swainson's hawk is a highly mobile bird species and individual birds foraging or otherwise occurring in the site could readily avoid construction areas or contact with construction equipment or personnel. Therefore, no impacts to individual foraging Swainson's hawk is anticipated. The loss of 2.56 acres of potential foraging habitat within the ruderal/disturbed habitat onsite would not be expected to significantly impact Swainson's hawks nesting in the region. Higher quality foraging habitat is abundant to the west and north of the site. If Swainson's hawk were to nest in or adjacent to the site during construction activities, noise, vibration, human presence, and other construction-related disturbances could disturb nests and potentially result in nest failure or lead to the abandonment of eggs or young.

No mitigation is necessary for potential impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. Ruderal/disturbed land is not considered suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and CDFW does not recommend requiring mitigation pursuant to CEQA for infill (within an already urbanized area) projects in areas which have less than five acres of foraging habitat and are surrounded by existing urban development, unless the project area is within 0.25 mile of an active nest tree (CDFW 1994). Potential impacts on nesting Swainson's hawk would be potentially significant. The implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 described below would reduce the potential of the proposed project to Swainson's hawk to a level of ***less than significant***.

White-tailed Kite

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 any of the biological surveys conducted for the proposed project. The nearest reported extant occurrences of white-tailed kite in the CNDDDB is located approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the project site near the Rio Linda Airport (CDFW 2020). Nesting habitat is present adjacent to the site in large trees and 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 project site during construction. 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 implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 described below would reduce the potential of the proposed project to white-tailed kite to a level of ***less than significant***.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

As noted in the previous section, migratory and non-game birds are protected during the nesting season by California Fish and Game Code. The project site and immediate vicinity provides nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of native birds common to urbanized areas, such as mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), and killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*). 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 implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 described below would reduce the potential of the proposed project to migratory birds and raptors to a level of ***less than significant***.

Question C

The project site contains three potentially jurisdictional features totaling 0.51 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and state: one seasonal pond (0.25 acre), and two wetland swales (0.26 acre). The site plan has been designed to avoid direct impacts to potentially jurisdictional aquatic features. The parking area proposed as part of the truck terminal yard would be separated from the wetlands on site by landscaping and fencing on the north and west sides of the parking area. The wetlands would be separated from the parking area on the east and south by curbs and additional landscaping. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would reduce the potential for any indirect impacts such as disturbances from activities and equipment related to construction or inadvertent disturbances of the wetlands during project operations. The implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 described below would reduce the potential for project impacts to potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources to a level of ***less than significant***.

The project would potentially result in the trimming and/or removal of up to six trees on the project site. The trees - one Gooding's black willow and five almond trees - are not protected by the City of Sacramento Tree Ordinance as the tree ordinance only protects native oaks, sycamores, and black walnuts. There is no impact to protected trees and no mitigation would be necessary.

MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 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 shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. As burrowing owls are year-round residents and have the potential to occupy burrows outside of the nesting season, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted regardless of the time of year. The survey shall occur within 30 days of the start of construction activities. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the following:

- A survey for burrows and owls should be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire project site 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 shall 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 CDFW “Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (March 2012). A survey report shall be prepared which is consistent with the Survey Report section of Appendix D of the CDFW “Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (March 2012).
- If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found the applicant shall 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 CDFW). 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.

MM BIO-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Swainson’s Hawk

Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted according to SHTAC guidelines to determine if there are nesting Swainson’s hawk within 0.5-mile of the project site. 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 shall determine the presence of active Swainson’s hawk nests in and within 0.5 mile of the project site using the most recent published survey protocols (i.e., 3 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 shall initiate consultation with CDFW to determine what measures need to be implemented 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 is required.

MM BIO-3 Avoid and Minimize Impacts to White-Tailed Kite and Other Raptors and Other Migratory 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 shall 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 shall include suitable raptor nesting habitat within 500 feet of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the project site 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., 500 feet for raptors; 100 feet for passerines) shall be established by a qualified biologist around active nests and no construction activities within the buffer shall 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 shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted.

MM BIO-4: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Aquatic Resources

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to avoid indirect impacts to potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources on the site:

Measures During Construction

- Grading, clearing, and other ground disturbing activities within the project site shall be confined to the minimal area necessary to facilitate construction activities. To ensure that construction equipment and personnel do not affect sensitive habitat outside of designated work areas, orange barrier fencing shall be erected to clearly define the habitat to be avoided. This will delineate the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) on the project. The integrity and effectiveness of ESA fencing and erosion control measures shall be inspected daily. Corrective actions and repairs shall be carried out immediately for fence breaches and ineffective erosion control BMPs.
- Standard construction BMPs shall be implemented throughout construction to avoid and minimize adverse effects to the water quality within the project site. Appropriate erosion control measures shall be used (e.g., hay bales, filter fences, vegetative buffer strips or other accepted equivalents) to reduce siltation and contaminated runoff from entering preserved wetlands or leaving the project site. The integrity and effectiveness of the BMPs shall be inspected daily by the resident engineer or site foreman. Corrective actions and repairs shall be carried out immediately. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material containing netting shall not be used at the project. Acceptable substitutes include coconut coir matting or tackifying hydroseeding compounds.
- Construction by-products and pollutants such as petroleum products, chemicals, or other deleterious materials should not be allowed to enter into preserved aquatic resources. A plan for the emergency clean-up of any spills of fuel or other materials should be available when construction equipment is in use.
- During construction, equipment shall be re-fueled and serviced at designated construction staging areas. All construction material and fill shall be stored and contained in a designated area that is located away from preserved wetlands to prevent transport of materials into adjacent streams. The preferred distance is 100 feet from the preserved wetlands. In addition, a silt fence shall be installed to collect any discharge, and adequate materials should be available for spill clean-up and during storm events.
- Construction vehicles and equipment shall be monitored and maintained to prevent contamination of soil or water from external grease and oil or from leaking hydraulic fluid, fuel, oil, and grease. Leaking vehicles and equipment shall be removed from the site.
- Construction materials storage areas containing hazardous or potentially toxic materials such as herbicides and petroleum products shall have an impermeable membrane between the ground and the hazardous material and shall be bermed to prevent the discharge of pollutants to ground water and runoff water. The bermed area shall at a minimum have the capacity to store the volume of material placed in it.
- All disturbed soils shall undergo erosion control treatment prior to October 15 and/or immediately after construction is terminated. Appropriate erosion control measures shall be used (e.g., hay bales, filter fences, vegetative buffer strips or other accepted equivalents) to reduce siltation and contaminated runoff from project sites. Erosion control blankets shall be installed on any disturbed soils steeper than a 2:1 slope or steeper.

Measures During Operations

- In order to prevent trucks and other vehicles from inadvertently entering the wetlands during operations, bollards and/or post and cable fence will be installed at the interface of the pavement and wetland features.

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
4. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u>			
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. Human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric contexts. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources, as identified in the 2035 General Plan Background Report, are typically located near the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses.

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 prehistoric 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- and prehistoric-period archaeological 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.

Regulatory Framework Related to Cultural Resources

State and federal legislation require the protection of historical and cultural resources. In 1971, President’s EO No. 11593 required that all federal agencies initiate procedures to preserve and maintain cultural resources by nomination and inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In 1980, the Governor’s EO No. B-64-80 required that state agencies inventory all “significant historic and cultural sites, structures, and objects under their jurisdiction which are over 50 years of age and which may qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.” Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that projects that cause “...physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired” shall be found to have a significant impact on the environment.

For the purposes of CEQA, an *historical resource* is a prehistoric or historic-era resource listed in or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). When a project could impact a resource, it must be determined whether the resource is an historical resource, which is defined as a resource that:

(A) is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, or cultural annals of California; and,

(B) Meets any 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; or 4) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

CEQA applies to prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources when (1) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a historical resource, or (2) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a *unique archaeological resource*. A unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that has a high probability of meeting any of the following criteria (PRC Section 21083.2(g)):

1. The archaeological resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. The archaeological resource has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. The archaeological resource is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Methods

Data for the assessment were 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 Setting

The project site is located within an industrial and residential area in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento and is surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development. The project site remains undeveloped and is generally bordered by a road and residential developments to the west of the project site and by commercial and residential uses to the north, east, and south. Magpie Creek, a seasonal but well-established drainage, runs from northeast to southwest and comes within 200 feet of the project site's northwest corner.

Area of Potential Effects and Study Area

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 historic-era or archaeological 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 is understood to be the area that would be subjected to ground disturbance during construction of the proposed project.

The APE for the proposed project measures approximately 3.6 acres and corresponds to the subject property described above in Section II Project Description. Because ground disturbances would be limited to grubbing and shallow, surficial grading, the APE's vertical dimension is estimated to be less than two feet below the current ground surface.

Cultural Setting

Prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic contexts for the City of Sacramento Policy Area have been provided in Section 6.4 of the Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report, available at <https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/General-Plan/2035-GP/Chapter-6--Environmental-Resources.pdf?la=en>.

Cultural Resources Records Search

A record's search in support of the proposed project was conducted at the NCIC on December 8, 2020. The records searches addressed all portions of the APE and a 0.25-mile radius around the APE (hereafter referred to as the study area). Sources of information included previous survey and cultural resources files; the NRHP; the 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.

The records search determined that no portions of the study area have been previously surveyed for cultural resources, and no historic-era or prehistoric sites or features have previously been recorded. No cultural resources in the study area have been listed in the NRHP, the CRHR, the Historic Property Data File, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, or local historic inventories. A review of historic aerial photographs, historic topographic maps, and General Land Office plat maps failed to provide evidence that structures had once been located within the APE.

Native American Outreach

On December 4, 2020, HELIX Senior Archaeologist, Clarus Backes, submitted a Sacred Lands File request for the project site to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Mr. Backes followed up with a second request on January 7, 2021. As of January 14, 2021, no response from the NAHC has been received.

Cultural Resources Survey

On December 17, 2020, HELIX Staff Archaeologist Jentin Joe conducted a pedestrian survey to characterize any prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources located within 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 survey determined that the entire APE is in a relatively disturbed condition. The area's flat topography reflects a history of fill, grading, and other modifications that have resulted in tire ruts, graded areas, and a gravel parking area. The majority of the APE is unvegetated or heavily dominated by a dense cover of non-native annual grasses, with small patches of native and non-native grasses and forbs. Modern trash was seen throughout the APE, and several cow pies indicate that the area has been used to graze cattle.

No prehistoric or historic-era artifacts or features were found during the survey. All of the cultural materials that were observed appear to be modern or cannot be attributed to a specific date range.

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).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONSQuestion A

The cultural resources records search indicated that no surveys have been conducted and no cultural resources have been documented within 0.25 mile of the proposed project's APE. No previously undocumented prehistoric or historic-era resources were found during the survey of the APE, which appears very disturbed. Although these findings seem to indicate that the area has a low sensitivity for buried cultural resources, its proximity to the historic alignment of Magpie Creek and the long history of use of the area by Native Americans suggest that there is a moderate potential for encountering buried cultural resources during construction. As such, subsurface construction activities such as excavation and trenching have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered cultural resources, resulting in a potentially significant direct impact. Because the ground disturbances associated with the project would be limited and no new structures are planned, secondary impacts to historical resources, including visual impacts, are expected to be negligible.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 proposed below, potential impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources would be reduced 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 and CUL-2 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 Measure CUL-3 proposed below, the potential for the proposed project to disturb previously undiscovered human remains would be reduced to a level of ***less than significant***.

MITIGATION MEASURES

MM CUL-1: Worker Awareness Training Program

Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities HELIX recommends that all construction personnel be trained in the protection of cultural resources, the recognition of buried cultural remains, and the notification procedures to be followed upon the discovery of archaeological materials, including Native American burials. The training should be presented by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology and should include recognition of both prehistoric and historic resources. Personnel should be instructed that unauthorized collection or disturbance of artifacts or other cultural materials is illegal, and that violators would be subject to prosecution under the appropriate state and federal laws. Supervisors should also be briefed on the consequences of intentional or inadvertent damage to cultural resources.

MM CUL-2: Inadvertent Discoveries

In the event that cultural resources are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities should be halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. If the site cannot be avoided during the remainder of construction, an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards should then be retained to evaluate the find's significance under CEQA. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and should be discussed in consultation with the City.

MM CUL-3: Accidental Discovery of Human Remains

There is always the possibility that ground disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown human remains. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, PRC Section 5097.98 must be followed. If there is a discovery or recognition of human remains during project-related earthmoving activities, the following steps shall be taken:

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the specific location or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the Sacramento County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98, or
2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his/her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in

accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendent or on the project area in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:

- The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission
- The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or

The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner

FINDINGS

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

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
5. <u>ENERGY</u> 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 2021) and the project site.

No elements of the proposed project would directly consume energy. Indirect energy consumption would be associated with the generation of electricity at power plants and energy consumed to source, treat, and transport water. 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.

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. 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 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 VMT (CEC and CARB 2003).

AB 1007 (Chapter 371, Statutes 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 CO₂ 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.

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

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.

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; and/or
- conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Neither federal or State law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish thresholds that define when energy consumption is considered wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary.

Construction of the project would require gasoline, diesel, and potentially other fuel sources to operate grading 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 2020):

- 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.

Sourcing landscape irrigation water would also consume a small amount of energy. While vehicle trips associated with the project (primarily truck 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.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Seismicity

The Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master EIR identifies all of the City of Sacramento 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

Terrain in the City of Sacramento features very little relief and the potential for slope instability within the City is minor due to its relatively flat topography. Topography of the site is largely flat with no major changes in grade, with small depressions containing aquatic resources. Elevation of the project site ranges from 39 to 42 feet above mean sea level.

Regional Geology

The project site lies in the Sacramento Valley portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province. The Great Valley is bordered to the north by the Cascade and the Klamath Ranges, to the west by the Coast Ranges, to the east by the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, and to the south by the transverse ranges. The valley formed by tilting of Sierran Block with the western side dropping to form the valley and the eastern side being uplifted to form the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. The valley is characterized by a thick sequence of sediments derived from erosion of the adjacent Sierra Nevada Mountain Range to the east and the Coast Range to the west. These sedimentary rocks are mainly Cretaceous in age. The depths of the sediments vary from a thin veneer at the edges of the valley to depths in excess of 50,000 feet near the western edge of the valley.

Project Site Soils

The property includes two soil mapping units (NRCS 2020): Hicksville loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, and San Joaquin fine sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes.

Hicksville loam soils occur at toeslopes and summits on terraces and hills and consist of alluvium. A typical profile is loam from 0 to 13 inches, clay loam from 13 to 43 inches, and sandy clay loam from 43 to 64 inches; the depth to water table is 0 inches. Hicksville loam is on the National Hydric Soils List for Sacramento County (NRCS 2015).

San Joaquin fine sandy loam soils occur at toeslopes on terraces and consist of alluvium derived from granite. A typical soil profile for San Joaquin fine sandy loam soil is fine sandy loam from 0 to 13 inches, sandy clay loam from 13 to 30 inches, clay loam from 30 to 35 inches, inundated from 35 to 60 inches, and stratified sandy loam or loam from 60 to 67 inches; the depth to water table is more than 80 inches.

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 potential effects related to the City's seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, and existing mineral and paleontological resources. 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. The project site is in an area of the City that is topographically flat. Seismically-induced landslides or landslides induced by soil failure typically occur on slopes with gradients of 30 percent or higher (City of Sacramento 2015b). According to the City's 2035 General Plan and the Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the existing on-site soils range from 0 to 3 percent slopes. Considering that the project site is topographically flat, the potential for seismically-induced or soil failure landslides does not exist.

Soil liquefaction is primarily associated with the saturated soil layers located close to ground surface. The soils lose strength during ground shaking generated by seismic events, which causes the soil to become mobile enough to permit both horizontal and vertical movements. Soils that are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, uniformly graded, saturated, fine-grained sands that live relatively close to the ground surface. However, loose sands that contain a significant number of fines may also liquefy. 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 (City of Sacramento 2015b).

Thus, the potential for the project site to experience geologic or seismic hazards related to liquefaction or fault rupture is low.

Soil Hazards

The proposed project would require grading during the construction period and would therefore require a Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to be submitted and approved as required by Chapter 15.88 of the City's Code. Chapter 15.88 of the City's Code (Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control) is used to regulate grading on property within the City of Sacramento to safeguard life, limb, health, property, and the public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other materials generated by surface runoff from construction activities; to comply with the City's NPDES Permit; and, to ensure graded sites within the City comply with all applicable City standards and ordinances.

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.

The proposed project would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, impacts would not occur due to inadequate soils being able to support such wastewater storage/disposal systems.

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. <u>HAZARDS</u>			
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, undeveloped and it contains no known hazardous materials (SWRCB 2021; DTSC 2021). The project site has been subject to activities such as staging materials and dinking since 1947. No hazardous materials are known to exist at the project site.

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 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).

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
- 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 posed by 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 QUESTIONSQuestion A

While the project site has been subject to activities such as staging of materials and diking since 1947, no permanent structures are currently or have historically been part of the project site. According to records searches of the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database and the Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database, 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).

The proposed project would construct a truck terminal yard that would include paved areas, fencing, and landscaping on the site. Grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb an approximately 70,000 square foot area of the site. Wetlands located on the site would remain undisturbed. Although the project would include disturbance of a significant portion of the project site because 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 historically been used for materials staging. 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. Furthermore, while construction of the proposed project would involve the use of 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. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no additional significant environmental effects** beyond what was previously analyzed in the Master EIR.

Question C

The proposed project would not be expected to require any on-site dewatering activities. The proposed project would include grading and construction activities in an approximately 3.6-acre area, avoiding wetlands present on site. Grading and excavation depths typically range from 0 to 36 inches for site grading. Groundwater would not be anticipated to be encountered at those depths. 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 and Hazardous Materials.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

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 06067C0062H as being partially located within an area designated as Zone X. Zone X is an area of minimal flood hazard, outside of the special flood hazard area and higher than the elevation of the 0.2-percent annual chance flood. The western edge of the project site falls within Zone X, while the majority of the site falls within an area protected from the 1-percent-annual-chance or greater flood hazard by a levee system.

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 Master EIR:

- 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

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.

It should be noted that the project site does include areas of wetlands as shown in Figure 3. The site design of the proposed project does not include development in these areas. For additional information about wetlands, please see the discussion in the Biological Resources section above.

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

Development of the site includes the creation of paved parking areas which would decrease the amount of pervious surfaces and increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the site. The overall paved area of the site would be approximately 70,000 square feet. Section 13.16 of the City's Code requires that post-development flow of the site must be equal or less than pre-development conditions.

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 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 partially located within Zone X. Zone X is an area of minimal flood hazard, outside of the special flood hazard area and higher than the elevation of the 0.2-percent annual chance flood. The remainder of the project site is located in an area protected from the 1-percent-annual-chance or greater flood hazard by a levee system and is not considered by FEMA to be at high risk for flooding. The project site is located within the Historic Magpie Creek local floodplain (which is recognized by the City of Sacramento but is not designated as a special flood hazard area by FEMA), with a 1% annual chance of flooding up to an elevation of approximately 42 feet which would include the project site (City of Sacramento 2016). However, the project does not include construction of structures and, as such, the proposed project would not place additional structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Considering that the proposed project would not result in a project-specific impact related to the exposure of future residents or structures to

flooding, 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 hydrology and water quality.

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
9. <u>NOISE</u>			
Would the project:			
A) Result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project's noise level increases?		X	
B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L _{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project?			X
C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento 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 or sound level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A weighting (dBA) to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time-averaged noise levels are expressed by the symbol L_{EQ}, with a specified duration. The community noise level is described using L_{DN} – the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day, obtained after an addition of 10 dBA to measured noise levels between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. to account for nighttime noise sensitivity. L_{DN} is also sometimes referred to as the day-night average noise level (DNL).

The amplitude of pressure waves generated by a sound source determines the loudness of that source. Sound pressure amplitude is measured in micro-Pascals (mPa). One mPa is approximately one hundred billionth (0.0000000001) of normal atmospheric pressure. Sound pressure amplitudes for different kinds of noise environments can range from less than 100 to 100,000,000 mPa. Because of this wide range of values, sound is rarely expressed in terms of mPa. Instead, a logarithmic scale is used to describe sound pressure level (SPL) in terms of dBA. The threshold of hearing for the human ear is about 0 dBA, which corresponds to 20 mPa.

Because decibels are logarithmic units, SPL 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 SPL of 70 dB 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 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 (Caltrans 2020).

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. Generally, a PPV of less than 0.08 in/sec does not produce perceptible vibration.

Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs) 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 NSLU to the project site is a single-family residence located on a parcel zoned for industrial uses adjacent to the project boundary to the south. Additional single-family residences are located across Santa Ana Avenue to the north and across Dry Creek Road to the west.

City of Sacramento Noise Standards

Section 8.68.60 of the City of Sacramento Municipal Code establishes exterior noise standards for 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, and by 15 dBA for cumulative periods of 1 minute per hour (City of Sacramento 2020).

The City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Policy 3.1.1 establishes normally acceptable noise levels of 60 dBA L_{DN} for residential – low-density single-family land uses and 75 dBA L_{DN} for industrial land uses (City of Sacramento 2015a).

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.

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) and interior (Policy EC 3.1.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.9, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 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.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Question A

The project would result in potential long-term noise increases in the project area due project-related traffic on area streets, project traffic circulating within the project site, and from internal combustion engine powered trucks operated on the project site. Trailer Refrigeration Units (TRUs) are not proposed to be operated on the project site, but are addressed in this section.

According to traffic counts conducted by the City, Dry Creek Road has an average daily traffic (ADT) of 5,021 vehicles in the project vicinity, and Santa Ana Road has an ADT of 780 vehicles in the project vicinity (City of Sacramento 2021). As described in the noise terminology discussion, above, a perceptible 3 dBA increase in traffic noise in the project area would require a doubling of noise level (e.g., a doubling of traffic volume). The project would add a maximum of 20 vehicles per day (10 heavy trucks and 10 autos), which would be less than 3 percent of existing traffic. Therefore, project traffic would not result in exterior noise levels in the project above the normally acceptable standard.

The noise resulting from circulation of cars and trucks with the project's driveway and parking areas was modeled using the Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) version 2021. CadnaA is a model-based computer program developed by DataKustik for predicting noise impacts in a wide variety of conditions. CadnaA vehicle noise prediction is based on the data and methodology used in the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) developed by the U.S. Department of public (USDOT) and calculates the daytime average hourly L_{EQ} from three-dimensional model inputs and traffic data. Traffic levels corresponding to the maximum anticipated daily traffic of 10 trucks and 10 autos were used in the modeled assuming that all vehicles would enter or leave the project site in a 1-hour period. Receivers were placed 1 meter (3.3 feet) outside the project boundary, approximately adjacent to the exterior wall of the closest residence adjacent to the project site to the south. The highest noise level predicted by the modeling for exterior spaces of the NSLU would be 56.5 dBA L_{EQ} , equivalent to 52.7 dBA L_{DN} assuming all vehicles would enter or leave the site during nighttime hours. This would not exceed the normally acceptable standard of 60 dBA L_{DN} for single-family residential land uses or the normally acceptable standard of 75 dBA L_{DN} for residential land uses. The model output tables and L_{DN} calculation printout are included as Appendix C to this Initial Study.

According to the project applicant, TRUs would not be operated for trucks or trailers parked on the project site. However, if TRUs were to be operated on the project site, the impact would be potentially significant, depending on the number and location of TRUs and hours of operation. Mitigation measure NOI-01 would prohibit internal combustion engine powered TRUs from being operated while parked on the project site during long-term operation of the project.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-01, operation of the project would not result exterior noise levels above the normally acceptable standard and all additional significant environmental effects would be mitigated to a level of ***less than significant***.

Question B

Traditional architectural materials typically used in residential construction attenuate noise levels by approximately 15 dBA. Therefore, if the project noise level at the exterior of the nearest NSLU would exceed 60 dBA L_{DN} , the interior noise levels would exceed the City standard of 45 dBA L_{DN} . As discussed in Question A, above, the highest calculated exterior noise level at the nearest NSLU would be 52.7 dBA L_{DN} , which would result in an interior noise level of 37.7 dBA L_{DN} . Therefore, operation of the project would not result in residential interior noise levels in excess of the City's threshold of 45 dBA L_{DN} and would have ***no additional significant environmental effects*** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question C

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). Mitigation Measure NOI-02 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-02, construction of the project would not result exterior noise levels exceeding the City standard and all additional significant environmental effects would be mitigated to a level of ***less than significant***.

Question D

Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving, would not be conducted by the project. A possible source of vibration during general project construction activities would be a vibratory roller used for gravel or asphalt compaction, A large vibratory roller could create

approximately 0.210 inch per second PPV at 25 feet (Caltrans 2020). It is not anticipated that vibratory rollers would be used with 25 feet of any residential or commercial structure. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in ground-borne vibration in excess of 0.5 inch per second PPV and would have **no additional significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

Question E

The project does not propose new highways or railroads and there are no existing highways or railroads in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of residential and commercial areas to 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

As discussed in Issue 3, *Cultural Resources*, above, areas withing a 0.25-mile radius around the project site do not contain historical structures or other vibration sensitive archeological sites. Therefore, historic buildings and archaeological sites would not be exposed to vibrations greater than 0.2 inch per second PPV due to project construction or highway traffic and the project would have **no additional significant environmental effects** beyond what has been previously identified in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

MM NOI-01: Restriction on Refrigeration Units

The City shall note in project approvals and on project use permits a restriction to prohibit the operation of internal combustion engine powered TRUs while trucks or trailers are parked within the project site.

MM NOI-02: Project Construction Activities

The applicant shall ensure that construction activities are consistent with City Code Section 8.68.060, *Exemptions*. 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 the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, and 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 level of **less than significant**.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in the northern portion of the City of Sacramento, approximately 6 miles northeast of the downtown core of the City, and is served with fire protection, police protection, and parks by the City of Sacramento.

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 17, located at 1311 Bell Avenue approximately 0.75 mile south of the project site.

Police 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 Blvd, approximately 1.9 miles south of the project site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, 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 17, located at 1311 Bell Avenue, approximately 0.75 mile south 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 paving the project site to create a truck terminal yard. 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
<p>11. <u>RECREATION</u></p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?</p>			X
<p>B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?</p>			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 ten 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 224 developed and undeveloped park sites and 4,255.5 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). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONSQuestions 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 truck terminal yard that would be used to store 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. 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
<p>12. <u>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</u></p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</p>			X
<p>B) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</p>			X
<p>C) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>			X
<p>D) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue. The 2035 General Plan categorizes Dry Creek Road as a minor collector, which provide for relatively short distance travel between and within neighborhoods. Santa Ana Avenue is categorized as a local street, 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 truck terminal yard with one driveway and parking for up to 36 trucks. Each parking stall would be approximately 68.5 feet long by 10.8 feet wide. Access to the facility would be provided by a newly constructed driveway. There would be one paved two-way driveway on the southwest corner of the site allowing ingress and egress to Dry Creek Road. The driveway would be 45 feet wide where they coincide with the Dry Creek Road and taper to 25 feet wide within the project site. Rows of truck parking stalls will have 100 feet between rows to allow for parking and facility access, and aisles would be 25 feet wide. A 5-foot-wide sidewalk would be added along the western and northern edges of the site along Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue.

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, Dry Creek Road has an ADT of 5,021 vehicles in the project vicinity, and Santa Ana Road has an ADT of 780 vehicles in the project vicinity (City of Sacramento 2021). The proposed project would add a maximum of 20 vehicles per day, up to 10 heavy trucks and up to 10 autos for worker commutes to and from the project site.

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 Impact 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 proposed project would generate a maximum of 20 vehicle trips per day, 10 of which would be heavy trucks and 10 of which would be autos used for worker commutes to or from the site. These trips would account for less than 3 percent of existing traffic on Dry Creek Road and Santa Ana Avenue (City of Sacramento 2021). None of the roadways in the vicinity of the proposed project are beyond an acceptable threshold for LOS, and the minimal increase in roadway traffic as the result of the proposed project would not change the level of service of any of the surrounding roadways. The project includes construction of sidewalks along the project site roadway frontage which would provide enhanced pedestrian access through the area.

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. The General Plan Update will be approved in 2021.

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 20 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 yard 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 southwest corner of the site that connects to Dry Creek Road. 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 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 a maximum of up to 20 vehicles 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
<p>13. <u>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</u></p> <p>Would the project:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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</p>		X	
<p>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.</p>		X	

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

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 site 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 TCR 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 December 4, 2020, HELIX Senior Archaeologist, Clarus Backes, submitted a Sacred Lands File request for the project site to the California NAHC. Mr. Backes followed up with a second request on January 7, 2021. As of January 14, 2021, no response from the NAHC has been received.

Native American Consultation

On April 28, 2020 formal invitations to participate in AB 52 consultation on the proposed project were sent by the City to the tribal representatives that have previously requested to receive notifications of proposed projects. These tribes represented include:

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

The Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, provided a response via email on May 21, 2020. stating that the Tribe is not aware of any known cultural resources within the project site. The City received a non-consultation letter/email from the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians closing consultation dated May 21, 2020.

The United Auburn Indian Community responded via email on May 21, 2020. UAIC stated that the Tribe is not aware of any TCR in the project site and that there is a low potential for unknown or buried TCRs to occur. UAIC requested that mitigation measures TCR-1a, TCR-1b, and TCR-1c, included below, be included in this initial study, and be implemented if unknown TCRs are encountered during project implementation The City received an email from UAIC closing consultation dated May 22, 2020.

The Buena Vista Rancheria Tribe responded via email on April 28, 2020. The Buena Vista Tribe stated that they are not aware of any known cultural resources within the project site. The Tribe requested further notification should discoveries of cultural resources be encountered. The City received email from the Buena Vista Tribe closing consultation on May 6, 2020.

The Wilton Rancheria Tribe did not request consultation for this project.

Regulatory Setting

Federal

There are no Federal plans, policies, or regulations related to TCR 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 TCR 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 TCR. TCR are defined in PRC Section 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 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.

Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 amended CEQA to mandate consultation with California Native American tribes during the CEQA process to determine whether a proposed project may have a significant impact on a TCR, and that this consideration be made separately from cultural and paleontological resources. Recognizing that California tribes are experts in their TCR and heritage, AB 52 requires that CEQA lead agencies carry out consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify TCR. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a TCR is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures. By including TCR early in the CEQA process, the legislature intended to ensure that local and tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available to identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCR.

The purpose of consultation is to identify TCR that may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and to allow the City to avoid or mitigate significant impacts prior to project approval and implementation. Section 21074(a) of the PRC defines TCRs, for the purpose of CEQA, as: Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

- a) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR; and/or
- b) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or
- c) 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Because criteria A and B also meet the definition of a Historical Resource under CEQA, a TCR may also require additional consideration as a Historical Resource. TCRs may or may not exhibit archaeological, cultural, or physical indicators and can only be identified by a culturally-affiliated tribe, which has been determined under State law to be the subject matter expert for TCRs.

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 CRHR 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 PRC 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 PRC Section 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 TCR 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 TCR as defined PRC Section 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 TCR), 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 TCR include identification of resources on project sites (Policy Historic Cultural Resources [HCR] 2.1.1); implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2); consultation with appropriate organizations and individuals including the NAHC 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).

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 through CUL-3) 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 an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology, as well as culturally affiliated Native American tribes. The City may invite Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to participate. 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 invited to review and comment on these 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 and tribes will be invited to monitor the installation of fencing. 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 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 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 tribal cultural resources can be mitigated to a level of ***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

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.

An existing drainage ditch follows the south side of Santa Ana Avenue in the northwest portion of the project site. An existing sewer cleanout is located in the southwest portion of the site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to 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 of the Master EIR.

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

Questions A and B

The project site is undeveloped and is not currently served with utilities or service systems. The proposed project is a paved parking lot that would serve as a truck terminal and would not require utilities such as wastewater collection, potable water, electricity, or natural gas. Because the proposed project would not require the use of existing utilities or the construction or expansion of utilities the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact. Considering that the proposed project would not result in a project-specific impact related to utilities and service systems, 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 utilities and service systems.

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, 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

The proposed project is consistent with the 2035 General Plan land use designation for the site and, thus, the proposed project was generally anticipated by the City in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master EIR. As such, the proposed project was included in the cumulative analysis of City buildout in the Master EIR. Applicable policies from the 2035 General Plan would be implemented as part of the proposed project, as well as the project-specific mitigation measures included in this IS/MND, to reduce the proposed project's contribution to potentially cumulative impacts. The potential impacts of the proposed project would be individually limited and would not be cumulatively considerable. As demonstrated in this IS/MND, all potential environmental impacts that could occur as a result of project implementation would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. When evaluated in addition to other closely related past, present or reasonably foreseeable future projects, development of the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts in the City of Sacramento and **no additional significant environmental effects** would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

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		

Section V - Determination

On the basis of the initial study:

I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 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

March 11, 2021

Date

Ron Bess

Printed Name

REFERENCES CITED

- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2018. Health Effects. Available at: <http://www.capcoa.org/health-effects/>.
2017. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2. Available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2021. Overview: Diesel Exhaust & Health. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health>. Accessed January 2021.
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. Staff report regarding mitigation for impacts to Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California. November 1.
2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl.
2020. RareFind 5.0, California Natural Diversity DataBase. Sacramento, California. Accessed June 2, 2020. Information expires 11/30/2020.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2018. *California State Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available at: <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983>. Accessed December 2020.
2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf>.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2020. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Website <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org> [Accessed 3 June 2020].
- City of Sacramento. 2015a. *2035 General Plan*. Available at: <http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Resources/Online-Library/2035--General-Plan>. Accessed December 2020.
- 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 December 2020.
2016. *Comprehensive Flood Management Plan*. Available at: <https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/DOU/Flood-Ready/2016%20CFMP.pdf>. Accessed March 2021.
2020. *Sacramento City Code*. Available at: <http://www.qcode.us/codes/sacramento/>. Accessed January 2021.
2021. Traffic Counts. Available at: <https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Traffic-Data-Maps/Traffic-Counts>. Accessed January 2021.

- Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. EnviroStor. Retrieved January 07, 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.
- National Environmental Title Research (NETR). 2020. *Historic Aerial Imagery Database*. Available at: <https://www.historicaerials.com/>.
- NatureServe. 2016. *Downingia pusilla Dwarf Downingia*. Available online at: https://explorer.natureserve.org/Taxon/ELEMENT_GLOBAL.2.128746/Downingia_pusilla.
- 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/>.
2020. Web Soil Survey. Available online at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed June 2, 2020.
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/air/cnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0>.
- Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. Available at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf. Accessed December 2020.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. Revised April. Available at: <http://www.airquality.org/Residents/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>.
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). 2021. <https://www.smud.org/en/Corporate/About-us/SMUDs-Territory-Map>. Accessed January 2021.
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. GeoTracker. Retrieved January 07, 2021, from <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Sacramento>.
- Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SHTAC). 2000. Recommended timing and methodology for Swainson's hawk nesting surveys in California's central valley. May 31.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 2005. Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon. Region 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. December 15.

2020. 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.

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.