

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT INFORMATION

CONTROL NUMBER: PLNP2021-00116

NAME: Fulton Avenue Auto Sales Use Permit

LOCATION: The project site is located at 2760 Fulton Avenue, on the east side of Fulton Avenue and approximately 800-feet south of Marconi Avenue, in the Arden Arcade community of unincorporated Sacramento County.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER: 268-0210-085

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project requests the following entitlements from the County of Sacramento:

1. A Use Permit to allow for automobile sales at 2760 Fulton Avenue on approximately 1.21± acres in the Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area.

This property is located within the Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area (SPA) with a designation of Avenue Thoroughfare. According to the permitted and restricted uses within the SPA, auto sales requires the approval of a Conditional Use Permit along with meeting specific use standards. It is a requirement that an office building of not less than 600 square feet be placed on the subject property and no outdoor loud speakers are permitted. The project consists of new landscaping along the Fulton Avenue street frontage. Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed the following Initial Study Combined Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area followed with a detailed evaluation of environmental impacts. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act as follows:

1. Potentially Significant Impact is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
2. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.
3. Less than Significant Impact applies where the project does not create an impact that exceeds a stated significance threshold.
4. No Impact applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. A No Impact answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a Lead Agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they

reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or another CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
<p>The project is consistent with environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, Arden Arcade Community Plan, Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area (SPA) and Sacramento County Zoning Code. This property is located within the Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area (SPA) with a designation of Avenue Thoroughfare. According to the permitted and restricted uses within the SPA, auto sales requires the approval of a Conditional Use Permit along with meeting specific use standards. It is a requirement that an office building of not less than 600 square feet be placed on the subject property and no outdoor loud speakers are permitted. The project consists of new landscaping along the Fulton Avenue street frontage.</p>				
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?				X
<p>The project will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community.</p>				
2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?				X
<p>The project does not propose new businesses or extension of infrastructure. There was an existing commercial shopping building on the property several years ago that was demolished.</p>				
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>The project will not result in the removal of existing housing, and thus will not displace substantial amounts of existing housing.</p>				
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?				X
<p>The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the current Sacramento County Important Farmland Map published by the California Department of Conservation. The site does not contain prime soils.</p>				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?				X
No Williamson Act contracts apply to the project site.				
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?				X
The project does not occur in an area of agricultural production.				
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?				X
The project does not occur in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.				
b. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?				X
The project is not located in a non-urbanized area.				
c. If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
It is acknowledged that aesthetic impacts are subjective and may be perceived differently by various affected individuals. Nonetheless, given the urbanized environment in which the project is proposed, it is concluded that the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity.				
d. Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
The project will result in a new source of lighting for the proposed automobile display area. The project is proposing two new light poles, spaced evenly apart on the subject property. Each light pole will contain four lights. The proposed light poles are over 300-feet to the nearest residential homes located to the east of the subject property. Therefore, the Fulton Avenue Special Planning Area (SPA) does not have any additional restrictions regarding the lighting. Compliance with development and lighting standards contained in the Sacramento County Zoning Code should insure that impacts are less than significant.				
5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:				
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?				X
The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip safety zones.				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?				X
The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip noise zones or contours.				
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?				X
The project does not affect navigable airspace.				
d. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.				
6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:				
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the site has existing water supply facilities and is completely developed with all necessary infrastructure. Placement of the proposed sales office is not anticipated to substantially impact existing service capacity.				
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?				X
The project site has existing wastewater disposal and treatment service through Sacramento Area Sewer District. Project development can be sustained by this existing service.				
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
The Kiefer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2050.				
d. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?				X
The project will not require construction or expansion of new water supply, wastewater treatment, or wastewater disposal facilities.				
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?				X

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Project construction would not require the addition of new stormwater drainage facilities.				
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?				X
Existing electric service will adequately support the proposed project.				
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?				X
The project would incrementally increase demand for emergency services, but would not cause substantial adverse physical impacts as a result of providing adequate service.				
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?				X
The project will not require the use of public school services.				
i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?				X
The project will not require park and recreation services.				
7. TRANSPORTATION - Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) – measuring transportation impacts individually or cumulatively, using a vehicles miles traveled standard established by the County?				X
The project is within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop/high quality transit corridor and is therefore presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.				
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?				X
No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project.				
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?				X
No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project; therefore no impacts to public safety on area roadways will result.				
d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
The project does not conflict with alternative transportation policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, with the Sacramento Regional Transit Master Plan, or other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.				
8. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:				
a. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?				X
The project does not exceed the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.				
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?				X
There are no sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, nursing homes, hospitals, daycare centers, etc.) adjacent to the project site. See Response 8.a.				
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
The project will not generate objectionable odors.				
9. NOISE - Would the project:				
a. Result in generation of a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
The project is not in the vicinity of any uses that generate substantial noise, nor will the completed project generate substantial noise. The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.				
b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?				X
Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact is less than significant due to the temporary nature of these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).				
c. Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.				X
The project will not involve the use of pile driving or other methods that would produce excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels at the property boundary.				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?				X
The project will not substantially increase water demand over the existing use.				
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
The project does not involve any modifications that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern and or/increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would lead to flooding.				
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?				X
The project is not within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, nor is the project within a local flood hazard area.				
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?				X
The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain.				
e. Develop in an area that is subject to 200 year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP)?				X
The project is not located in an area subject to 200-year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP).				
f. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
The project will not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.				
g. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?				X
The project does not propose any physical changes that would affect runoff from the site. Adequate on- and/or off-site drainage improvements will be required pursuant to the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance and Improvement Standards.				
h. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?				X

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Compliance with the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively) will ensure that the project will not create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality.				
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				X
Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will ensure less than significant impacts.				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?				X
Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?				X
The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit.				
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?				X
A public sewer system is available to serve the project.				
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?				X
The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located on the project site.				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.				
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project. No special status species are known to exist on or utilize the project site, nor would the project substantially reduce wildlife habitat or species populations.				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project. No sensitive natural communities occur on the project site, nor is the project expected to affect natural communities off-site.				
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project. No protected surface waters are located on or adjacent to the project site.				
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project. The project site is already developed. Project implementation would not affect native resident or migratory species.				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and no sensitive resources will be impacted as a result of this project. No native and/or landmark trees occur on the project site, nor is it anticipated that any native and/or landmark trees would be affected by off-site improvement required as a result of the project.				
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?				X
The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources.				
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?				X
There are no known conflicts with any approved plan for the conservation of habitat.				
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?				X
No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project.				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?				X
No known archaeological resources occur on-site.				
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains.				
14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?				X
Previously, a commercial building of approximately 10,000 square feet was located on the site and was demolished in 2017. Therefore, the property is completely paved and the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources.				
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.				

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?				X
The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
The project does not involve the use or handling of hazardous material.				
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?				X
The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.				
e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?				X
The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan.				
f. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to or intermixed with urbanized areas?				X
The project is within the urbanized area of the unincorporated County. There is no significant risk of loss, injury, or death to people or structures associated with wildland fires.				
16. ENERGY – Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction?				X
While the project will introduce a 600 square foot office building and increase energy consumption, compliance with Title 24, Green Building Code, will ensure that all project energy efficiency requirements are net resulting in less than significant impacts.				
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X
The project will comply with Title 24, Green Building Code, for all project efficiency requirements.				
17. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X

Environmental Issues & Supporting Information:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
The project will fully implement BMP 1 and BMP 2 of the 2020 GHG significance thresholds; therefore, the climate change impact of the project is considered less than significant.				
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?				X
The project is consistent with County policies adopted for the purpose or reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.				

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	Commercial Office	X		
Community Plan	Arden Arcade	X		
Land Use Zone	Fulton Ave SPA	X		

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Joelle Inman

Senior Environmental Analyst: Meg De Courcy

Associate Environmental Analyst: Rebecca Boschee

Office Manager: Belinda Wekesa-Batts

Administrative Support: Justin Maulit