

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-0060

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

March 3, 2015

CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM FOR THE SACRAMENTO 2035 GENERAL PLAN PROJECT (LR12-03)

BACKGROUND

- A. On January 15, 2015, the City Planning and Design Commission conducted a public hearing on the Sacramento 2035 General Plan and forwarded it to the City Council with a recommendation to approve.
- B. On March 3, 2015, the City Council conducted a noticed public hearing (Sacramento City Code Section 17.812.030 (B)3(b) (publication), and received and considered evidence concerning the Sacramento 2035 General Plan and Master EIR (Project).

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

- Section 1. The City Council finds that the Master Environmental Impact Report for the Sacramento 2035 General Plan (MEIR), which consists of the Draft MEIR, and the Final MEIR (Response to Comments and Mitigation Monitoring Program), has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures.
- Section 2. The City Council certifies that the MEIR was prepared, published, circulated, and reviewed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures, and that it constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective, and complete Final Master Environmental Impact Report in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures.

- Section 3. The City Council certifies that the MEIR has been presented to the Council and that the City Council has reviewed the MEIR and has considered the information contained in the MEIR prior to acting on the Project, and that the MEIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis.
- Section 4. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 and 15093, and in support of its approval of the Project, the City Council adopts the attached Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations in support of approval of the Project as set forth in the attached Exhibit A of this Resolution.
- Section 5. Pursuant to CEQA section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, and in support of its approval of the Project, the City Council adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program to require all reasonably feasible mitigation measures be implemented by means of Project modifications and other measures, as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program in the attached Exhibit B of this Resolution.
- Section 6. The City Council directs that, upon approval of the Project, the City's Environmental Planning Services shall file a notice of determination with the County Clerk of Sacramento County and, if the Project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA section 21152.
- Section 7. Pursuant to Guidelines section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from, the Office of the City Clerk at 915 I Street, Sacramento, California. The City Clerk is the custodian of records for all matters before the City Council.

Table of Contents:

Exhibit A – CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sacramento 2035 General Plan

Exhibit B – Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Sacramento 2035 General Plan

Adopted by the City of Sacramento City Council on March 3, 2015, by the following vote:

Ayes: Members Carr, Hansen, Harris, Jennings, Schenirer, Warren and Mayor Johnson

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Member Ashby

Vacant: District 6

Attest:

Shirley Concolino

Digitally signed by Shirley Concolino
DN: cn=Shirley Concolino, o=City of Sacramento, ou=City
Clerk, email=sconcolino@cityofsacramento.org, c=US
Date: 2015.04.01 16:03:16 -07'00'

Shirley Concolino, City Clerk

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sacramento 2035 General Plan

Description of the Project

The City of Sacramento is considering a proposed update to its general plan, called Sacramento 2035 General Plan, which is the subject of this Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR). A general plan is a state-required, legal document, prepared in accordance with California Government Code Section 65300 et seq. The general plan provides guidance to the City regarding the physical form and character of Sacramento's land use and development, as well as the conservation of its resources. The current proposal is a technical update and refinement of the 2030 General Plan, which was a comprehensive revision adopted by the City in 2009. Policy 1.1.3 and Table 4-1, Program 2, of the 2030 General Plan require the City to conduct such an update every five years. In addition to technical policy updates, the technical review and update reset the planning horizon for the General Plan from 2030 to 2035.

In adopting the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan, the City of Sacramento seeks to achieve the following objectives, consistent with the objectives stated in the current 2030 General Plan.

- **Character of Place.** Preserve and enhance Sacramento's quality of life and character as a city with diverse residential neighborhoods, an extensive urban forest, and role as the center of California's governance.
- **Smart Growth.** Encourage future growth in the city inward into existing urbanized areas and the central business district to foster infill development, as well as encourage density of development and integration of housing with commercial, office, and entertainment uses that fosters increased walking and reduced automobile use.
- **Live More Lightly.** Strive to meet the intent of Assembly Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, by reducing carbon emissions that contribute to global warming by encouraging "green" building practices, use of solar energy systems, and developing a land use pattern that supports walking, biking, and public transit.
- **Maintain a Vibrant Economy.** Support a diversity of business and employment opportunities by retaining existing and attraction of new businesses; maintain and expand recreational, arts, and cultural facilities; and nurture diverse community events and celebrations.
- **Healthy Cities.** Preserve and enhance land use patterns and densities that foster pedestrian and bicycle use and recreation through expanded parklands, sports, and athletic programming as well as provide incentives for

expanding the availability of organic foods, and protecting residents from crime and natural or terrorist acts.

- **Sustainable Future.** Accommodate growth that protects important environmental resources as well as ensures long-term economic sustainability and health, and equity or social wellbeing for the entire community.

The proposed 2035 General Plan is a technical update of the 2030 General Plan. Elements, chapters, or sections of the existing General Plan have not been re-organized or comprehensively changed. In summary, the technical update focused on the following topical areas:

- **Update forecast for the planning timeframe through 2035:** The 2030 General Plan and MEIR evaluated projected growth through the year 2030. The significant slowdown in development activity since 2008 warranted a “dial down” of the housing, employment, and population projections to be consistent with SACOG’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan and an extension of the planning horizon to 2035.
- **Update of the Housing Element:** The City’s current Housing Element addresses for the period from 2008 to 2013. The new Housing Element covers the period from 2013 to 2021. The Housing Element was adopted by City Council in December 2013.
- **Update of Traffic Level of Service.** One of the primary policy changes in the proposed 2035 General Plan is the modification of Policy M 1.2.2 relating to level of service (LOS). This policy calls for the City to implement a flexible context-sensitive LOS standard. The City’s specific vehicle LOS thresholds have been defined based on community values with respect to modal priorities, land use context, economic development, and environmental resources and constraints. As such, the City will strive 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 and F are allowed.
- **Compliance with recent flood risk legislation:** AB 162, SB 5, and the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan require a revised approach to consideration of flood risks in the General Plan and were recognized in the update of the 2035 General Plan policies.
- **Integration of the Climate Action Plan into the 2035 General Plan:** The Climate Action Plan strategies, measures, and actions that reduce greenhouse gas emissions have been incorporated into appropriate elements of the proposed General Plan. The General Plan also includes descriptions of climate change risks and policies, measures, and actions throughout the General Plan Elements to address adaptation to climate change impacts.

Findings Required Under CEQA

1. Procedural Findings

The City Council of the City of Sacramento finds as follows:

Based on the nature and scope of the Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update, SCH #2012122006, (herein after the Project), the City of Sacramento's Environmental Planning Services determined, based on substantial evidence, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment and prepared a master environmental impact report ("MEIR") on the Project. The MEIR was prepared, noticed, published, circulated, reviewed, and completed in full compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §15000 et seq.), and the City of Sacramento environmental guidelines, as follows:

- a. A Notice of Preparation of the Draft MEIR was filed with the Office of Planning and Research and each responsible and trustee agency and was circulated for public comments from December 5, 2012 through January 22, 2013.
- b. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft MEIR were distributed to the Office of Planning and Research on August 8, 2014 to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the Project, or which exercise authority over resources that may be affected by the Project, and to other interested parties and agencies as required by law. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought.
- c. An official 45-day public comment period for the Draft MEIR was established by the Office of Planning and Research. The public comment period began on August 11, 2014 and ended on September 25, 2014.
- d. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft MEIR was mailed to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals who had previously requested notice in writing on August 11, 2014. The NOA stated that the City of Sacramento had completed the Draft MEIR and that copies were available at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, California 95811. The letter also indicated that the official 45-day public review period for the Draft MEIR would end on September 25, 2014.
- e. A public notice was placed in the Sacramento Bee on August 11, 2014, which stated that the Draft MEIR was available for public review and comment.

f. A public notice was posted in the office of the Sacramento County Clerk on August 11, 2014.

g. Following closure of the public comment period, all comments received on the Draft MEIR during the comment period, the City's written responses to the significant environmental points raised in those comments, and additional information added by the City were added to the Draft MEIR to produce the Final MEIR.

2. Record of Proceedings

The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these findings:

- a. The proposed City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update;
- b. The City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report;
- c. Resolution No. 2015-0061 making findings of fact and adopting the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update;
- d. Draft and Final MEIR for the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference;
- e. Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Sacramento 2030 General Plan.
- f. All Notices of Preparation and other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update and MEIR;
- g. Resolution No. 2015-0060 certifying the Master Environmental Impact Report for and making Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations in support of the adoption of the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update;
- h. The Sacramento 2030 General Plan and all updates;
- i. Resolution No. 2009-131 making findings of fact and adopting the Sacramento 2030 General Plan;
- j. Master Environmental Impact Report for Sacramento 2030 General Plan, City of Sacramento, March 2009 and all updates;
- k. Resolution No. 2009-130 certifying the Master Environmental Impact Report for and making Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding

Considerations in support of the adoption of the Sacramento 2030 General Plan and all updates;

l. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACPG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Plan (MTP/SCS), April 2012;

m. The Sacramento City Code;

n. All records of decision, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, minutes of meetings and hearings, referrals, and other planning documents contained in City's files and prepared by City boards and commissions, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Sacramento 2035 General Plan;

o. All testimony, documents, and other evidence contained in the City's files that were submitted to and received by the City by or on behalf of landowners, business owners, private organizations, public agencies, and members of the public in connection with the Sacramento 2035 General Plan;

p. Minutes and verbatim transcripts contained in the City's files of all workshops, information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Sacramento 2035 General Plan;

q. All testimony and documentary or other evidence contained in the City's files that were submitted to the City at workshops, information sessions, public meetings and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Sacramento 2035 General Plan.

r. Matters of common knowledge to the City Council, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*, December 2009.

(2) California Department of Water Resources, *2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan*, June 2012.

(3) Other formally adopted City policies and ordinances.

s. Planning and Development Code of the City of Sacramento

3. Findings

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environment impacts that would otherwise occur. Mitigation measures or alternatives are not required,

however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, sub. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, sub. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, sub. (b).)

In seeking to effectuate the substantive policy of CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible, an agency, in adopting findings, need not necessarily address the feasibility of *both* mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating approval of a proposed project with significant impacts. Where a significant impact can be mitigated to an "acceptable" level solely by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternative that could also substantially lessen or avoid that same impact — even if the alternative would render the impact less severe than would the proposed project as mitigated. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California ("Laurel Heights I")* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

In these Findings, the City first addresses the extent to which each significant environmental effect can be substantially lessened or avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Only after determining that, even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, an effect is significant and unavoidable does the City address the extent to which alternatives described in the EIR are (i) environmentally superior with respect to that effect and (ii) "feasible" within the meaning of CEQA.

In cases in which a project's significant effects cannot be mitigated or avoided, an agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if it first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the "benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment." (Public Resources Code, Section 21081, sub. (b); see also, CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15093, 15043, sub.(b).) In the Statement of Overriding Considerations found at the end of these Findings, the City identifies the specific economic, social, and other considerations that, in its judgment, outweigh the significant environmental effects that the Project will cause.

The California Supreme Court has stated that “[t]he wisdom of approving ... any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Goleta II* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553 at 576.)

In support of its approval of the Project, the City Council makes the following findings for each of the significant environmental effects and alternatives of the Project identified in the EIR pursuant to Section 21080 of CEQA and section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines:

A. Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.

Policies and Implementation Programs included in the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Update were designed to reduce potential impacts to the environment resulting from buildout of the General Plan. The MEIR demonstrates how proposed policies reduce potential environmental impacts. These policies are part of the proposed project and are not considered mitigation measures; however it is meaningful for decision makers to understand how proposed policies have been designed to reduce environmental impacts. In each of the following impacts, the policies identified in the MEIR have reduced the respective impact, and the impact is less than significant.

Agricultural Resources

Impact 4.1-1: Conversion of Important Farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Applicable Policies: ER 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. These policies encourage infill development and compact new development to avoid the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses. Policy 4.2.3 calls for the City to cooperate with the County of Sacramento and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation lands.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.1-2: Incompatibility with surrounding agricultural operations outside the Policy Area.

Applicable Policies: ER 4.2.2 through 4.2.5. Policy ER 4.2.2 requires the City to work with Sacramento County, Natomas Basin Conservancy, and other entities to establish a method to protect and permanently preserve a one-mile buffer that can serve as a means to preserve viable agricultural activities and as

a community separator between Sutter and Sacramento counties and along the Sacramento River. Policy ER 4.2.3 ensures that the City would work with Sacramento County and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation plans to preserve prime farmland and critical habitat. Policy ER 4.2.4 requires open space or other appropriate buffers to protect the viability of existing agricultural operations and health and safety of residents in adjacent areas. Policy ER 4.2.5 requires that purchasers of homes located in the vicinity of agricultural operations be provided notification of such activities by way of their deeds and/or escrow documentation.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.1-3: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.

Applicable Policies: ER 4.1.1, ER 4.1.2, ER 4.2.1, ER 4.2.4. Policy ER 4.1.1 would incentivize provision of community gardens and rooftop gardens in new development projects. Policy ER 4.1.2 promotes opportunities for urban agriculture (community gardens) and recognizes their value in providing fresh food in urban areas in addition to their recreational, community building, landscaping, and educational value. Policy ER 4.2.1 encourages infill development and compact new development within the existing urban areas in order to prohibit the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands for urban uses.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Air Quality

Impact 4.2-1: Potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of Sacramento Valley regional air quality planning efforts.

Applicable Policies: ER 6.1.1 through ER 6.1.3. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.3 requires development projects to incorporate emissions reduction features to reduce emissions equal to 15% below the unmitigated emissions level.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.2-2: Potential to result in short-term construction-generated emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter.

Applicable Policies: ER 6.1.1, ER 6.1.2, 6.1.15. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.15 requires preference to be given to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and service contracts.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.2-4: Potential for TAC emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors.

Applicable Policies: LU 2.7.5, ER 6.1.2, and ER 6.1.4. Policy LU 2.7.5 promotes high quality of development character along freeway corridors and protects the public from adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy ER 6.1.4 requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and will impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.2-5: Potential exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive odors

Applicable Policies: LU 2.7.5, ER 6.1.4. Policy LU 2.7.5 promotes high quality of development character along freeway corridors and protects the public from adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration. Policy ER 6.1.4 requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and will impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-1: Potential impact to special-status plant species due to substantial degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of population or habitat below self-sustaining levels.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.5, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-2: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status invertebrates.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER

2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-3: 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.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.7 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-4: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status amphibians and reptiles.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.7 through ER 2.1.12, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-5: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status mammals.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6 through ER 2.1.8, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. Policy

ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-6: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status fish.

Applicable Policies: ER 1.1.6, ER 1.1.10, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 1.1.6 requires control of the volume, frequency, duration and peak flows rate and runoff velocity from development projects to reduce downstream erosion and protect stream habitat. Policy ER 1.1.10 requires implementation of watershed awareness and other water-quality-related educational programs. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors.

Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-7: Loss or modification of riparian habitat.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.1, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.5, ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.2 requires preservation, protection, and access to designated open space areas along rivers, floodways, and floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-8: Impacts on state or federally protected wetlands and/or waters of the United States through direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.11, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.11, ER 2.1.12, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State

and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-9: Loss of CDFW-defined sensitive natural communities, such as elderberry savanna, northern claypan vernal pool, and northern hardpan vernal pool.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, U 1.1.12, ER2.1.1, ER 2.1.3, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17, NN.LU 1.41, NN.U 1.2. Policy LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy U 1.1.12 requires location and design of utilities to avoid or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and habitats. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources. North Natomas Community Plan Policy NN.LU 1.41 allows 50% of the required landscape setback to be used as open space, recreation, or habitat preservation, and NN.U.1.2 provides for taking

advantage of opportunities for recreation, open space, habitat, wetland enhancement, recreation and utility uses for drainage systems.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-10: Substantial reduction in the number of trees within the Policy Area.

Applicable Policies: ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.8, ER 3.1.1, ER 3.1.3, ER 3.1.8, EC 2.1.16. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 3.1.1 requires maintenance and implementation of an Urban Forest Management Plan. Policy ER 3.1.3 requires retention of City Heritage Trees, or where tree removal cannot be avoided, tree replacement or appropriate remediation. ER 3.1.8 requires the City to promote the importance and benefits of trees and the urban forest. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.3-12: Contribution to regional loss of sensitive natural communities including wetlands and riparian habitat in the region.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, LU 9.1.1, U 1.1.12, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.12 through ER 2.1.17, ER 4.2.3. LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy U 1.1.12 requires location and design of utilities to avoid or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and habitats. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. . Policy ER 2.1.2 requires preservation, protection, and access to designated open space areas along rivers, floodways, and floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian resources by preserving

native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. . Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.14 supports efforts to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts. Policy ER 2.1.15 supports active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce the impact of climate change stressors and improve resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

Impact 4.5-1: Exposure of people to risk from seismic hazards, such as groundshaking and liquefaction.

Applicable Policies: PHS 3.1.8, EC 1.1.1, EC 1.1.2. Policy PHS 3.1.8 requires review of proposed facilities that would produce or store hazardous materials for seismic and geologic hazard, proximity to residential development, and the nature of the risk. Policies EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2 require the City to keep up-to-date records of seismic conditions, implement and enforces the most current building standards, and continue to require that site-specific geotechnical analyses be prepared for projects within the city and that report recommendations are implemented.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.5-2: Exposure of people to risk associated with unstable soil conditions, including expansive soils and subsidence.

Applicable Policies: EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2. Policies EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2 require the City to keep up-to-date records of seismic conditions, implement and enforces the most current building standards, and continue to require that site-specific geotechnical analyses be prepared for projects within the city and that report recommendations are implemented.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.5-3: Potential to cause substantial soil erosion.

Applicable Policies: EC 1.1.2 and ER 1.1.7. Policy EC 1.1.2 requires that each project within the city prepare a geotechnical investigation to determine site-specific seismic and soil characteristics and recommend appropriate mitigation measures to mitigate any potential impacts. Proposed Policy ER 1.1.7 requires that necessary erosion control measures are used during site development activities for all projects in the city.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.5-4: Loss of the availability of known mineral resources of State, regional, or local importance.

Applicable Policies: ER 5.1.1, ER 5.1.2, ER 5.1.3. Policies ER 5.1.1 and ER 5.1.3 protect mineral extraction activities within the city from surrounding uses. For areas where future development could occur, proposed General Plan Policy ER 5.1.2 requires that future projects near mining activities are compatible with such activities and requires buffer and setbacks from areas classified as MRZ-2.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.5-5: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

Applicable Policy: HCR 2.1.16. Policy HCR 2.1.16 requires the City to identify and protect paleontological resources in compliance with accepted protocols. Specifically, Implementation Program 13 requires amendment of the Sacramento

Code to require discovery procedures for paleontological resources found during grading, excavation, or construction.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 4.6-1: Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities.

Applicable Policies: LU 2.8.5, PHS 2.2.9, PHS 3.1.1, PHS 3.1.2, PHS 3.1.4, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.3 through 4.1.6. Policy LU 2.8.5 requires discouragement of establishment or expansion of potentially hazardous uses that have the potential to disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. Policy PHS 2.2.9 requires inclusion of emergency responders in the review of development proposals to ensure adequate emergency response times. Policy PHS 3.1.1 requires that buildings and sites under consideration for new development or redevelopment are investigated for the presence of hazardous materials prior to development activities. Policy PHS 3.1.2 requires that property owners of contaminated sites develop plans to investigate and manage hazardous material contamination to prevent risk to human health or the environment. Policy PHS 3.1.4 requires restriction of hazardous materials transport to designated routes. Policy PHS 4.1.1 requires maintenance and implementation of the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan to address disasters. Policy PHS 4.1.3 requires the City, in conjunction with other local, State, and Federal agencies, to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, conduct annual training for staff, and maintain, test, and update equipment to current standards. Policy PHS 4.1.4 requires coordination with local and regional jurisdictions to conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in mutual aid agreements to ensure adequate resources, facilities, and support for emergency response. Policy PHS 4.1.6 requires sponsorship and support of educational programs related to emergency response, disaster preparedness, and disaster risk reduction.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.6-2: Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the General Plan.

Applicable Policies: LU 2.8.5, LU 7.2.8, PHS 3.1.1 through 3.1.8, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.3 through PHS 4.1.6, PHS 5.1.8, EC 2.1.21, EC 2.1.23, SA.M 1.11, SA.M 1.12, SA.PHS 1.1, NS.LU 1.30. Policy LU 2.8.5 requires discouragement

of establishment or expansion of potentially hazardous uses that have the potential to disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. Policy LU 7.2.8 requires industrial uses that use toxic or hazardous materials to be sited away from existing or planned residential, commercial, or employment uses and to prepare Hazardous Substance Management Plans to limit contamination potential. Policy PHS 3.1.4 restricts transportation of hazardous materials to designated routes within the city to protect public safety. However, it is possible that small quantities of hazardous materials could be transported along roads throughout the city on a daily basis. Policy PHS 3.1.5 encourages clean industries within the city, while discouraging businesses that require onsite treatment of solid waste. With implementation of Policy PHS 3.1.6, future development of hazardous material treatment, storage, and disposal facilities would be consistent with the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan and compatible with nearby land uses. Policy PHS 3.1.7 requires continued education of residents and business regarding reduction or elimination of hazardous materials and products and encouragement for use of safer, nontoxic, environmentally friendly equivalents. Policy PHS 3.1.8 requires review of proposed facilities that would produce or store hazardous materials for seismic and geologic hazard, proximity to residential development, and the nature of the risk. The City would also maintain a Multi-Hazard Emergency Response Plan to address hazardous materials spills as required by Policy PHS 4.1.1. Policy PHS 4.1.3 requires the City, in conjunction with other local, State, and Federal agencies, to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, conduct annual training for staff, and maintain, test, and update equipment to current standards. Policy PHS 4.1.4 requires coordination with local and regional jurisdictions to conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in mutual aid agreements to ensure adequate resources, facilities, and support for emergency response. Policy PHS 4.1.6 requires sponsorship and support of educational programs related to emergency response, disaster preparedness, and disaster risk reduction. South Area Community Plan Policies SA.M 1.11 and 1.12 relate to airport safety and planning. SA.PHS 1.1 promotes emergency service coverage in the Valley Hi/North Laguna area. North Sacramento Community Plan Policy NS.LU 1.30 allows low intensity uses in proximity to airport safety zones associated with McClellan Airport operations.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.6-3: Effects to emergency vehicle response times resulting from change in LOS standard.

Applicable Policies: M 1.3.3, M 4.1.1, M 4.2.6, PHS 1.1.2, PHS 1.1.4, PHS 1.1.5, PHS 2.1.2, PHS 2.1.4, PHS 2.1.5, PHS 2.1.7, PHS 4.1.5. Policies M 1.1.3, M 4.1.1 and M 4.2.6, prioritizes emergency service needs when developing

transportation plans, making transportation network changes and creating new street configurations. Policies PHS 1.1.2 and PHS 2.1.2, to achieve and maintain optimal response times for police, fire, and emergency medical services. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in mutual aid agreements to ensure adequate resources, facilities, and support for emergency response.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Flooding

Impact 4.7-1: Potential to degrade water quality due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or operational activities.

Applicable Policies: ER 1.1.1 through ER 1.1.10. Policies ER 1.1.1 – 1.1.10 require: the City to meet water quality requirements of the Phase 1 NPDES Permit; construction contractors to comply with erosion and sediment control and stormwater discharge regulations; watershed education to City staff; and preparation of watershed drainage plans.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.7-2: Potential to generate new sources of polluted runoff that could violate water quality standards.

Applicable Policies: U 1.1.1 – 1.1.5; ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.6. Policies U1.1.1 through 1.1.5 require that the City provides and maintains adequate stormwater drainage utility services. Policies ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.10 implement measures to reduce post-construction increases in runoff rates, maintain agreements for selected on-site stormwater quality facilities through the development permit process, reduce use of chemicals applied for landscape use, provide recycling programs and facilities to prevent unauthorized dumping, and provide watershed education to City staff.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.7-3: Potential to increase exposure of the number of people and/or property to risk of injury and damage from a major flood event.

Applicable Policies: U 4.1.1 through U 4.1.5, EC 2.1.2 through EC 2.1.16. Policies EC 2.1.1 through EC 2.1.28, and Implementation Programs 2 through 9 minimize flood-related impacts to existing and new city residents and essential public facilities. Most notably, Policy EC 2.1.13 requires the City to work with SAFCA to achieve by 2020 local-certification of levees for 200-year flood protection. And Policy EC 2.1.11 requires evaluation of potential flood hazards prior to City approval of development projects in order to determine whether the proposed development is reasonably safe from flooding and consistent with DWR Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria, which is the level of protection that is necessary to withstand a 200-year flood. The policy goes on to state that the City shall not approve new development or a subdivision or enter into a development agreement for any property within a flood hazard zone unless the adequacy of flood protection specific to the area has been demonstrated. Policy EC 2.1.28 requires the City to partner with relevant organizations and agencies when updating critical flood plans (including FEMA and DWR flood hazard maps; the City's Comprehensive Flood Management Plan; and the County-wide Local Hazard Mitigation Plan) to consider of the impacts of urbanization and climate change on long-term flood safety and long-term flood event probabilities.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Noise and Vibration

Impact 4.8-3: Potential for construction noise levels to exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance.

Applicable Policy: EC 3.1.10. Policy EC 3.1.10 requires proponents of development projects to assess potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses and to minimize impacts on these uses, to the extent feasible.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.8-5: Exposure of residential and commercial areas to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to adjacent highway traffic and rail operations.

Applicable Policy: EC 3.1.6. Policy EC 3.1.6 requires new residential and commercial projects located adjacent to major freeways, hard rail lines, or light rail lines to conduct a site-specific vibration study and implement all feasible mitigation, including design features, setbacks, and wall and window insulation. Implementation of this policy would limit vibration impacts and would ensure adherence to vibration guidelines.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.8-6: Exposure of historic buildings to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.

Applicable Policy: EC 3.1.7. Policy EC 3.1.7 would ensure that the City require an assessment of the damage potential of vibration-induced construction activities or proposed new light rail lines in close proximity to historic buildings and require all feasible mitigation measures be implemented to ensure no damage would occur, including setbacks, pre-drilling for piles, use of screw piles, and other best practices.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Parks and Recreation

Impact 4.9-1: Potential physical deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities due to increased use.

Applicable Policies: ERC 2.1.1, ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8, ERC 2.2.11, ERC 2.2.17, ERC 2.2.18, ERC 2.4.1, ERC 2.4.2, ERC 2.5.1, ERC 2.5.4. Policy ERC 2.1.1 requires the City to develop and maintain a complete system of public parks and open space areas throughout Sacramento that provides opportunities for both passive and active recreation. Policies ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8 require maintenance and implementation of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan, appropriate timing of parks development, provision of accessible parks within one-half mile of residences, meeting service level standards and goals, exploring creative solutions to provide neighborhood park facilities, preservation and replacement of parks, and prioritization of park investment. Policy ERC 2.4.1 requires the City to maintain service levels to provide linear parks/parkways and trails/bikeways. Policy 2.4.2 requires coordination with local, regional, and State partners to manage, preserve, and enhance the Sacramento and American River Parkways and other local waterways and riparian corridors. Policy ERC 2.5.4 requires the City to fund the costs of acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks and community and recreation facilities through land dedication, in lieu fees, and/or development impact fees.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.9-2: Potential to increase need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Applicable Policies: ERC 2.1.1, ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8, ERC 2.2.11, ERC 2.2.17, ERC 2.2.18, ERC 2.4.1, ERC 2.4.2, ERC 2.5.1, ERC 2.5.4. Policy ERC 2.1.1 requires the City to develop and maintain a complete system of public parks and open space areas throughout Sacramento that provides opportunities for both passive and active recreation. Policies ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8 require maintenance and implementation of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan, appropriate timing of parks development, provision of accessible parks within one-half mile of residences, meeting service level standards and goals, exploring creative solutions to provide neighborhood park facilities, preservation and replacement of parks, and prioritization of park investment. Policy ERC 2.4.1 requires the City to maintain service levels to provide linear parks/parkways and trails/bikeways. Policy 2.4.2 requires coordination with local, regional, and State partners to manage, preserve, and enhance the Sacramento and American River Parkways and other local waterways and riparian corridors. Policy ERC 2.5.4 requires the City to fund the costs of acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks and community and recreation facilities through land dedication, in lieu fees, and/or development impact fees.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Public Services

Impact 4.10-1: Potential need to construct new or expanded facilities related to the provision of police protection.

Applicable Policies: PHS 1.1.1 through PHS 1.1.7, PHS 1.1.12. Policy PHS 1.1.1 calls for the City to prepare a Police Master Plan to address staffing needs, facility needs, deployment strategies, and service goals. The Master Plan would be the guiding document for police services in the city. Policies PHS 1.1.2 and PHS 1.1.3 require that the City maintain optimum staffing levels and response times in order to provide quality police services to the community. Policy PHS 1.1.4 mandates that the City keep pace with all development and growth within the city and adequate facilities and staffing are available to serve residents prior to occupation of new development. Policies PHS 1.1.5 and PHS 1.1.12 also deal with the distribution and cooperative delivery of services to residents within the city to ensure optimal police response to all city residents. Policy PHS 1.1.6 seeks to co-locate police facilities with other City facilities, such as fire stations, when appropriate, to promote efficient use of space and efficient provision of police protection services within dense, urban portions of the city.

Policy PHS 1.1.7 seeks to prevent crime by implementing Crime Prevention through Environmental Design strategies.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.10-2: Potential need to construct new, or expand existing facilities related to the provision of fire protection.

Applicable Policies: PHS 2.1.1 through PHS 2.1.7, PHS 2.1.10, PHS 2.2.4, PHS 2.2.7, PHS 2.2.8. Policy PHS 2.1.1 calls for the City to prepare a Fire Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan would be the guiding document for the provision of fire services in the city. Policies PHS 2.1.2 and PHS 2.1.3 require that the City maintain emergency response times and staffing levels to ensure optimal fire protection in the community. Policy PHS 2.1.4 further requires additional fire protection resources be supplied when a fire station/company experiences call volumes exceeding 3,500 in a year and Policy PHS 2.1.6 requires that new fire stations are located strategically throughout the city to provide optimum response times to all areas. Policies PHS 2.1.5 and PHS 2.1.7 require new development to set aside land for future fire stations and ensure that adequate fire protection and emergency medical response facilities, equipment, and staffing are available prior to occupation of new development and redevelopment areas. PHS 2.2.4 ensures that adequate water supplies, pressure, and infrastructure are available in infill and newly developing areas. Policies PHS 2.2.7 and PHS 2.2.8 require that the City work to inform the SFD of potential wildland risks and impose a method to increase fire prevention. In addition, Policy PHS 2.1.10 requires that the City work with other agencies to provide regional cooperative delivery of fire protection and emergency medical services.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.10-3: Potential to impact schools due to generation of additional elementary, middle, and high school students.

Applicable Policies: ERC 1.1.1 through ERC 1.1.3. Policies ERC 1.1.1 and ERC 1.1.2 encourages the City to work with school districts to ensure that schools are provided to serve all existing and future residents and constructed in the neighborhoods that they serve, in safe locations, and connected to surrounding uses by walkways, bicycle paths, and greenways. Policy ERC 1.1.3 suggests that schools be developed with joint uses to integrate recreational, cultural, and non-school related activities.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 10-4: Potential to impact higher education facilities due to generation of additional post-secondary students.

Applicable Policies: ERC 1.1.5, ERC 1.1.7. Policy ERC 1.1.5 encourages the development, expansion, and upgrade of higher education facilities. Policy ERC 1.1.7 requires the City to cooperate with higher education systems to explore the possibility of a multi-university campus.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.10-5: Potential need to construct new or expanded facilities related to the provision of library services.

Applicable Policies: ERC 3.1.1 through ERC 3.1.4, ERC 3.1.7. Policy ERC 3.1.1 requires that adequate library services and facilities are maintained for all residents. Policies ERC 3.1.2 and ERC 3.1.4 address siting including locating libraries in higher density and infill areas, near arterials and transit routes, and in joint-operation with public and private agencies at locations such as school sites or community centers. These policies ensure that libraries are accessible to a wide range of people and are near major community gathering locations. Policy ERC 3.1.3 gives library construction priority to areas in the city that are underserved. Policy ERC 3.1.7 ensures that funding methods are explored jointly between the City and Sacramento Public Library Authority.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.10-6: Potential need to construct new or the expanded emergency response facilities related to the provision of emergency services.

Applicable Policies: PHS 4.1.1 through PHS 4.1.5, PHS 5.1.1. Policies PHS 4.1.1 through PHS 4.1.4 are aimed at ensuring that there is adequate disaster preparedness in the city. The City must maintain the Emergency Operations Plan that includes information on disaster preparedness, ensure the operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, train staff and conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans, and sponsor and support educational programs pertaining to emergency response, disaster preparedness protocols and procedures, and disaster risk reduction. Policy PHS 4.1.5 ensures that the City participate in

mutual aid agreements to ensure that adequate resources, facilities, and other support is provided in the event of a disaster. Policy PHS 5.1.1 would help ensure that adequate human services and medical facilities are established in the city to serve the city population.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Public Utilities

Impact 4.11-1: Potential to increase demand for potable water beyond available supply.

Applicable Policies: U 2.1.11 through 2.1.16, and U2.1.17. Policy U 2.1.11 requires implementation of conservation programs to increase water efficiency. Policy U2.1.12 continues the City's enforcement of water conservation measures. Policy U2.1.13 requires continued investigation of recycled water. Policy U.2.1.14 requires promotion of rain capture systems. Policy U2.1.14 requires the use of water-efficient landscaping in all new development. Policy U2.1.15 requires the use of native and climate appropriate plants; and U.2.17, which requires continued public education and outreach campaigns to promote water conservation. Implementation of these policies would reduce demand for potable water.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.11-3: Potential to generate additional wastewater and stormwater, which could require the expansion of existing conveyance facilities.

Applicable Policies: U 1.1.1 through U.1.1.8, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.3, U 3.1.4, and U 4.1.1 through U 4.1.3. Policies U 1.1.1 through U 1.1.8 require adequate provision of utilities, establishment and maintenance of citywide utility service standards, provision of sustainable utility facilities and services, requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share cost, development and implementation of a utilities financing strategy, identification and prioritization of infill areas for infrastructure improvements, and supporting development of joint-use facilities. Policy U 3.1.2 requires design of public facilities and infrastructure to meet ultimate capacity needs. Policy U 3.1.3 requires development of design standards to reduce infiltration into new City-maintained sewer pipes. Policy U 3.1.4 requires continuation of rehabilitation of the Combined Sewer System to decrease flooding and outflows or overflows. Policy U 4.1.1 that requires the City to ensure that all new drainage facilities are adequately sized to accommodate stormwater runoff. Policy U 4.1.2 requires the

City to ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are designed pursuant to basin master plans and Policy U 4.1.3 states that the City shall coordinate with the County as well as other agencies in the development of regional stormwater facilities.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.11-4: Potential to require the need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities, which could adversely affect the environment.

Applicable Policies: U 1.1.1 through U.1.1.8, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.3, U 3.1.4. Policies U 1.1.1 through U 1.1.8 require adequate provision of utilities, establishment and maintenance of citywide utility service standards, provision of sustainable utility facilities and services, requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share cost, development and implementation of a utilities financing strategy, identification and prioritization of infill areas for infrastructure improvements, and supporting development of joint-use facilities. Policy U 3.1.2 requires design of public facilities and infrastructure to meet ultimate capacity needs. Policy U 3.1.3 requires development of design standards to reduce infiltration into new City-maintained sewer pipes. Policy U 3.1.4 requires continuation of rehabilitation of the Combined Sewer System to decrease flooding and outflows or overflows.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.11-5: Potential to result in the construction of new solid waste facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Applicable Policies: U 5.1.1 through U 5.1.25. Policies 5.1.1 requires the city to achieve zero waste to landfills by 2040 through reusing, reducing, and recycling solid waste, and in the interim, achieve a waste reduction goal of 75% diversion by 2020 over 2005 levels and 90% diversion by 2030. Policies 5.1.2 through 5.1.4 require continued coordination with the County in providing long-term disposal capacity and GHG reduction, provision of adequate transfer station facilities, and ensuring equitable distribution of solid waste and recycling facilities. The programs provided through Policies U 5.1.5 to U 5.1.13 are designed to ensure the City continues to provide recycling and clean-up services for its residents and businesses. Many of these programs are already in place, and continue to promote waste diversion, which will help reduce waste flow to landfills. Policies U.5.1.15 to U.5.1.21 provide long-term objectives for minimizing the city's contribution to solid waste by providing additional encouragement and education regarding recycling and development of new techniques for solid

waste disposal. Policies U5.1.22 through U5.1.25 promote composting and vermiculture, education and outreach related to composting, support Solid Waste Authority's Sacramento Greencycle effort, and sponsor educational programs regarding benefits of solid waste diversion and recycling.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.11-6: Potential to require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities.

Applicable Policies: U 6.1.1 through U 6.1.17. Policies U 6.1.1 through U 6.1.4 require the City to work closely with local utility providers to ensure adequate provision of electricity and natural gas, reduction of peak electric load by 10% by 2020 compared to 2004, reduction of fleet GHG emissions by 75% by 2020 compared to 2005, and improve energy efficiency of City facilities by 25% by 2030 compared to 2005. Policy U 6.1.5 would encourage new and existing residential and commercial developers to use renewable and recyclable energy and consume 25 percent less energy compared to the baseline year of 2005. Policies U 6.1.6 through U 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would help reduce the cumulative impacts associated with non-renewable energy sources. Standards and incentives related to energy-efficiency proposed by Policies U 6.1.10 through U 6.1.13 would have a lasting positive effect on the cumulative impacts in the Policy Area. Policies U 6.1.11 through U 6.1.17 require energy efficiency improvements, incentives, partnerships, and education.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.11-7: Potential to require the construction of new or expansion of existing telecommunication facilities.

Applicable Policies: U 7.1.1 through U 7.1.8. Policies U 7.1.1, U 7.1.2, U 7.1.4, and U 7.1.6 would allow the City to work closely with telecommunications providers to maintain necessary service levels while regulating development of new facilities. Policy U 7.1.2 would ensure utility companies retrofit areas that do not have facilities that meet current telecommunication technologies and provide strategies for long-range planning of telecommunication facilities for new development areas. Additionally, Policy U 7.1.6 specifically requires the City to implement state-of-the-art internal telecommunication facilities and software in large scale planned communities and office and commercial developments. Policies U 7.1.3 and U 7.1.4 address future advances in telecommunication, and ensure that utility providers within the city would be encouraged to maintain

state-of-the-art facilities and practices, including those that help minimize demand for telecommunication services and, subsequently, construction of new facilities.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.12-1: Potential to adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and other non-auto mobility in conjunction with planned future development in the region.

Applicable Policies: M 1.1.1, M 1.2.1 through M 1.2.3, M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5, M 1.4.3, M 4.2.1 through M 4.2.6, LU 1.1.5, LU 2.6.1, LU 2.7.6, LU 4.1.3, LU 4.1.6, and LU 4.2.1. Policy M1.1.1 requires the City to preserve and manage rights-of-way consistent with City standards. Policies M1.2.1 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions and quality of the system and prioritization of emergency service needs when developing transportation plans and network changes. Policies M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.4.3 encourages residential developments to participate in or create Transportation Management Associations to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips. Policies M 4.2.1 through M 4.2.6 promotes pedestrian and bicycle transportation by ensuring that roadway projects designate sufficient travel spaces for all users, Ensuring adequate street tree canopy, addition of pedestrian and bicycle facilities on bridges, designate multi-modal corridors in the Central City, and identifying and filling gaps to make streets more complete. Policy LU 1.1.5 promotes infill development, reuse, and growth, including promoting pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. Policy LU 2.6.1 promotes compact development patterns, mixed use, and higher-development intensities that facilitate walking, bicycling, and transit use. Policy LU 2.7.6 requires new development and reuse and investment projects to create walkable, pedestrian-scaled blocks, publicly accessible mid-block and alley pedestrian routes where appropriate, and sidewalks appropriately scaled for the anticipated pedestrian use. Policy LU 4.1.6 promotes better multi-model connections between residential neighborhoods and community-supportive destinations. Policy LU 4.2.1 requires the City to pursue opportunities to promote walking and biking in existing suburban neighborhoods.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.12-2: Adverse effects to roadway LOS within the Policy Area associated with planned future development in the region.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, and M 1.4.2. Policy M 1.2.2 requires implementation of a flexible Level of Service (LOS) standard. Policies M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.12-5: Potential construction-related impacts to the local roadway network.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 4.1.1, LU 2.5.1. Policy M 1.2.2 requires implementation of a flexible Level of Service (LOS) standard. Policy M 1.4.1 promotes increase in vehicle occupancy. Policy LU 2.5.1 requires new development to maximize connection and minimize barriers between neighborhoods, corridors, and centers.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Visual Resources

Impact 4.13-1: Creation of a new source of light or glare that is substantially greater than typical urban sources and may cause sustained annoyance and/or hazard for nearby, visually sensitive receptors, such as neighborhood residents.

Applicable Policies: LU 6.1.12, ER 7.1.3, ER 7.1.4. Policy ER 7.1.3 requires that misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary outdoor lighting be minimized. Policy LU 6.1.12, Compatibility with Adjoining Uses, includes a requirement for lighting to be shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses. Policy ER 7.1.4 prohibits new development from (1) using reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface and on the

bottom three floors, (2) using mirrored glass, (3) using black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building, (4) using metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building, and (5) using exposed concrete that exceeds 50 percent of any building. These design features would minimize potential impacts related to daytime glare.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Impact 4.13-2: Interference with an important, existing scenic resource or degrade the view of an important, existing scenic resource, as seen from a visually sensitive, public location.

Applicable Policies: LU 2.2.1 through 2.2.3, LU 2.3.1, LU 2.3.2, LU 5.6.4, LU 5.6.5, LU 6.1.12, LU 9.1.4, ER 7.1.1, ER 7.1.2, ER 7.1.5. Policies LU 2.2.1 through LU 2.3.3 encourage access to and protection of rivers and waterways by encouraging conservation and restoration and improving access. Policy LU 2.3.2 requires development adjacent to parks and opens spaces to complement and benefit the park and opens space in part by preserving visual access, requiring development to front, using single-loaded streets, providing pedestrian and multi-use trails. Policy LU 5.6.5 protects views of the capitol by requiring conformance with the Capitol View Protection Act. Policy LU 6.1.12 requires compatibility with adjoining uses, including height, setbacks, landscaping, and lighting. Policy LU 9.1.4 requires use of open space to soften edges between urban and natural environments. Policy ER 7.1.1 would guide the City to avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects of new development on views from public places to the Sacramento and American Rivers and adjacent greenways, landmarks, and the State Capitol along Capitol Mall. This is further complemented by Policy ER 7.1.2, which states that the City shall require new development be located and designed to visually complement the natural environment/setting when near the Sacramento and American Rivers, and along streams.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

Climate Change

Impact 4.14-1: Potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.4, LU 1.1.5, LU 1.1.10, LU 2.2.2, LU 2.3.1, LU 2.4.1, LU 2.5.1, LU 2.5.2, LU 2.6.1, LU 2.6.3 through 2.6.11, LU 2.7.6, LU 2.8.4, LU 2.8.6, LU 4.1.1 through 4.1.4, LU 4.1.6 through 4.1.10, LU 4.2.1, LU 4.2.2, LU 4.3.1, LU 4.3.2, LU 4.4.6, LU 4.5.2, LU 4.5.3, LU 4.5.4, LU 4.5.5, LU 5.1.2,

LU 5.1.4, LU 5.1.5, LU 5.4.1, LU 5.4.2, LU 5.4.3, LU 5.5.1, LU 5.6.2, LU 5.6.3, LU 6.1.1 through LU 6.1.6, LU 6.1.8, LU 6.1.9, LU 7.1.2, LU 7.1.4, LU 8.2.2, LU 8.2.6, LU 8.2.7, LU 9.1.3, LU 10.1.3, HCR 2.1.6, HCR 2.1.7, HCR 2.1.10 through HCR 2.1.12, HCR 2.1.14, HCR 2.1.15, HCR 2.1.17, ED 1.1.7, ED 3.1.9, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.4.1 through M 1.4.3, M 1.5.1, M 1.5.2, M 1.5.4, M 1.5.5, M 2.1.1 through M 2.1.5, M 2.1.7, M 2.1.9, M 3.1.1 through M 3.1.5, M 3.1.8 through M 3.1.10, M 3.1.12, M 3.1.13 through M 3.1.20, M 3.2.1 through M 3.2.5, M 3.3.1, M 4.2.1 through M 4.2.6, M 4.3.1, M 4.3.2, M 4.4.2 through M 4.4.4, M 5.1.1 through M 5.1.14, M 6.1.1, M 6.1.2, M 6.1.4, M 6.1.7, M 6.1.8, M 9.1.3, U 1.1.8, U 1.1.9, U 2.1.2, U 2.1.10 through U 2.1.17, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.5, U 4.1.2, U 4.1.5, U 4.1.6, U 5.1.1, U 5.1.2, U 5.1.4, U 5.1.8, U 5.1.10 through U 5.1.17, U 5.1.20 through U 5.1.25, U 6.1.2 through U 6.1.11, U 6.1.13 through U 6.1.17, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.7, PHS 5.1.7 through PHS 5.1.15, ER 1.1.1, ER 1.1.8, ER 1.1.9, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.14 through ER 2.1.16, ER 3.1.1 through ER 3.1.9, ER 4.1.1, ER 4.2.1 through ER 4.2.3, ER 6.1.1 through ER 6.1.3, ER 6.1.5 through ER 6.1.14, EC 2.1.28. The proposed General Plan contains a comprehensive strategy that achieves a community-wide GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, and sets the City on course towards reducing ongoing GHG emissions reductions in the future through 2035 and 2050. The proposed 2035 General Plan incorporates the GHG reduction strategy of the 2012 CAP, which demonstrates the project's 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 emissions reduction efforts beyond 2020, and progress toward meeting long-term GHG emissions reduction goals. Policy 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 reduction goals.

Finding: The provisions of the 2035 General Plan identified above will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Master EIR and the impact is less than significant.

B. Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts for which Mitigation is Outside the City's Responsibility and/or Jurisdiction.

Mitigation measures to mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen the following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project, are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the City. Pursuant to section 21081(a)(2) of the Public Resources Code and section 15091(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City Council, based on the evidence in the record before it, specifically finds that implementation of these mitigation measures can and should be undertaken by the other public agency. The City will request, but cannot compel implementation of the identified mitigation measures described. The impact and mitigation measures and the facts supporting the determination that mitigation is within the responsibility and

jurisdiction of another public agency and not the City, are set forth below. Notwithstanding the disclosure of these impacts, the City Council elects to approve the Project due to the overriding considerations set forth below in Section G, the statement of overriding considerations.

Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.12-3: Potential adverse effects to roadway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions resulting from planned development under the 2035 General Plan, such that the jurisdiction's minimum acceptable level-of-service thresholds are not met.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, and M 1.4.2. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Mitigation Measure: 4.14-1 Widen 47th Avenue from 4 to 6 Lanes. Widening the segment of 47th Avenue between SR 99 and Stockton Boulevard from 4 lanes to 6 lanes would mitigate this impact by improving operations on this segment to LOS B. This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Because this segment of 47th Avenue is a county road and does not fall within the City's jurisdiction, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure. This mitigation measure is also not consistent with the County of Sacramento's General Plan and may be infeasible due to physically constrained right-of-way.

Finding: Widening this segment of 47th Avenue is not consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan. Implementation of this mitigation measure could also result in additional environmental impacts. This section of 47th Avenue is highly urbanized; however, vacant land does exist along this alignment, as well as drainage features. Potential impacts could include construction-related pollutant emissions, impacts to special-status wildlife species and wetlands, impacts related to water quality, impacts to historic and archaeological resources, impacts related to construction noise and traffic noise, land use impacts, and potential displacement of existing land uses. It is possible that mitigation measures are available to reduce most of these impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, this project would require additional CEQA analysis at the time it is proposed by Sacramento County, and the CEQA analysis could identify

significant impacts that may not be able to be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level. **For these reasons, the impact remains *significant and unavoidable*.**

Impact 4.12-4: Potential impacts to freeway segments.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, M 1.4.2, M 1.5.6, M 1.5.7, M 4.1.5. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips. Policy M 1.5.6 supports State highway expansion consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS. Policy 1.5.7 requires the City to work with Caltrans and adjacent jurisdictions to identify funding for improvements that address cumulative effects of planned development on the freeway system. Policy M 4.1.5 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and other agencies in the context of multimodal corridor planning to determine the appropriate responsibilities to fund, evaluate, plan, design, construct, and maintain new river crossings.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in potentially significant traffic impacts—based on the Caltrans LOS threshold and related significance standards—for fifteen freeway segments. Implementation of policy M 1.5.6 would require that the City support State highway expansion and management plans consistent with the SACOG MTP/SCS. All freeway improvement projects contained in the MTP/SCS were incorporated into the 2035 General Plan transportation analysis. In addition, implementation of Program 17 would require creation of a City development impact fee program that would fund multi-modal projects that would further alleviate congestion on the freeway segments identified above. However, the extent to which these impacts would be alleviated by City impact fee policies cannot be determined at this point, because this would be a new fee program. Since Caltrans has the decision-making authority on implementing improvements to the above freeway segments, the City of Sacramento cannot guarantee implementation and/or the timing of State highway improvements. It is also not certain that improvements to State highways have been identified that would substantially reduce impacts to all of these freeway segments. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

D. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.

The following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project, including cumulative impacts, are unavoidable and cannot be mitigated in a manner that would substantially lessen the significant impact. Notwithstanding disclosure of these impacts, the City Council elects to approve the Project due to overriding considerations as set forth below in Section G, the statement of overriding considerations.

Air Quality

Impact 4.2-3: Potential to result in long-term operational emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter that could contribute to a violation of air quality standards. Without mitigation, this is a *significant impact*.

Applicable Policies: ER 6.1.1 through 6.1.3, 6.1.12 through 6.1.15. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.3 requires development projects to incorporate emissions reduction features to reduce emissions equal to 15% below the unmitigated emissions level. Policy ER 6.1.12 promotes reduced idling and trips, more efficient routing, and use of public transportation, carpooling, and alternate modes. Policy ER 6.1.13 requires the City to continue purchase of low-emission vehicles for the fleet and to use clean fuel sources for trucks and heavy equipment. Policy ER 6.1.14 encourages use of zero-emission and low-emission vehicles, bicycles, and other non-motorized vehicles, and car-sharing programs by requiring sufficient and convenient infrastructure. Policy ER 6.1.15 requires preference to be given to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and service contracts.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: The proposed General Plan includes Policy ER 6.1.3, which requires individual development projects that would exceed the SMAQMD ROG and NOX operational thresholds of 65 lb/day to incorporate design or operational features that result in at least a 15 percent reduction in emissions; and Policy ER 6.1.2, which requires City review of proposed development projects to ensure construction and operation of projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce emissions through project design (e.g., measures contained in SMAQMD's Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions [SMAQMD 2013e]). Projects with significant operational emissions that reduce ozone precursor emissions by 15 percent through preparation of an SMAQMD-approved Air Quality Mitigation Plan are considered less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated by SMAQMD. The proposed general plan policies require implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. However, when taken together, the total mitigated emissions attributable to growth allowed under the General Plan would be a considerable contribution to cumulative air pollutant

emissions in the region. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-11: Contribution to regional loss of special-status plant or wildlife species or their habitat.

Applicable Policies: LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, LU 9.1.1, ER 2.2.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17, ER 4.2.3. LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. . Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate with State and Federal resources agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider potential impact on sensitive plant and wildlife species for each project and for habitat assessments to be conducted as needed. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.14 supports efforts to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts. Policy ER 2.1.15 supports active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce the impact of climate change stressors and improve resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources. Policy ER 4.2.3 requires the City to continue to work with the County and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation plans to preserve prime farmland and critical habitat outside the city.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would contribute to the loss of regional biological resources through the incremental conversion of habitat for special-status species to urban uses and, thus, limit the availability and accessibility of remaining natural habitats to regional wildlife and reduce overall habitat values. It could also adversely affect threatened and/or endangered species through habitat conversion or direct loss of individuals. Although future development within the Policy Area would be required to comply with the goals and policies contained in the 2035 General Plan, in combination with compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA), and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, and the Fish and Game Code, permanent reduction of habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species, potential loss of sensitive species, and incremental reduction of natural habitats and their environmental values would not be entirely avoided. While compliance with the above-mentioned policies and regulations would reduce the Policy Area's cumulative contribution to the regional loss of special-status and sensitive plant and wildlife, and their habitats, an incremental degradation or loss of habitats, species, and natural values would remain a considerable contribution to the overall cumulative impact. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4-1: Change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.

Applicable Policies: HCR.1.1.1 through 1.1.3, 2.1.1 through 2.1.17, 2.1.18, 3.1.1 through 3.1.4, and LU 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 2.1.8, 2.4.2, 2.6.5, ERC 5.1.4, 5.1.5, CC.HCR 1.1, 1.2. Policies HCR 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 maintains the City's status as a Certified Local Government (CLG), maintains a Preservation Office, Commission, and program to administer preservation programs, and maintains code provisions for a preservation program consistent with Federal and State requirements. Policies 2.1.1 through 2.1.17 ensure compliance with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws through identification of resources, consultation with appropriate organizations, agencies, and individuals, providing incentives and enforcing regulations, supporting pursuit of eligibility for listing, including preservation in planning efforts, maintaining all City-owned historic and cultural resources consistent with State and Federal law, seeking funding for surveys, consider demolition of historic resources as a last resort, develop compliance protocols to protect archaeological and cultural resources, review and evaluate individual development projects to minimize impact on historic and cultural resources. Policies HRC 3.1.1 through 3.1.4 promote heritage tourism,

explore public/private partnerships for preservation programs, provide historic and cultural resources information to the public. Policy LU 1.1.5 promotes infill development and ensures integrity of historic districts. Policy LU 2.1.2 preserves, protects, and enhances established neighborhoods. Policy LU 2.1.8 promotes infill development, reuse, rehabilitation, and reuse efforts that contribute positively to existing neighborhoods and surrounding areas. Policy LU 2.4.2 requires building design that respects and responds to local context, including consideration of cultural and historic contexts. Policy LU 2.6.4 encourages retention of existing structures and promotes their adaptive reuse and renovation with green building technologies to retain the structures' embodied energy, increase energy efficiency, make it more energy efficient, and limit the generation of waste. Policies ERC 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 maintain and protect Historic City Cemetery and Old Sacramento Historic District. Central City Community Plan Policy CC HCR 1.1 and 1.2 require support programs for preservation of historically and architecturally significant properties and continuation of the development of historic "Old Sacramento" as a major tourist, entertainment, and cultural area in the region.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: With the 2035 General Plan policy framework, the probability of demolition of historic properties would be reduced. Policy HCR 2.1.15 requires the City to consider demolition of historic resources as a last resort to be permitted only if the rehabilitation of the resource is not feasible and demolition is necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its residents, or the public benefits outweigh the loss of the historic resource. Following Policy HCR 2.1.2, if a property is not already listed in the Sacramento, California, or National registers, the City would require the evaluation of resources 50 years and older for their eligibility for inclusion in the California or Sacramento registers. In order to comply with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes to protect and assist in the preservation of historic resources, per HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.8, discretionary projects involving eligible historic resources would be analyzed for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Projects that comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would result in the preservation of historically significant resources. However, the policies and environmental processes of review would not prevent the demolition of all historic properties. In some instances due to public health or safety reasons, it may be infeasible to protect a historic resource and it may need to be demolished. As discussed above, Policy HCR 2.1.14 requires the City to consider demolition as a last resort to be permitted only if rehabilitation is not feasible. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Impact 4.4-2: Change in the significance of an archaeological resource as

defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.

Applicable Policies: HCR.1.1.1 through 1.1.3, 2.1.1 through 2.1.6, 3.1.1 through 3.1.4, and ERC 5.1.4. Policies HCR 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 maintains the City's status as a Certified Local Government (CLG), maintains a Preservation Office, Commission, and program to administer preservation programs, and maintains code provisions for a preservation program consistent with Federal and State requirements. Policies 2.1.1 through 2.1.6 ensure compliance with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws through identification of resources, consultation with appropriate organizations, agencies, and individuals, providing incentives and enforcing regulations, supporting pursuit of eligibility for listing, and including preservation in planning efforts. Policies HRC 3.1.1 through 3.1.4 promote heritage tourism, explore public/private partnerships for preservation programs, provide historic and cultural resources information to the public. Policies ERC 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 maintain and protect Historic City Cemetery and Old Sacramento Historic District.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: For all discretionary projects resulting from buildout of the proposed General Plan, policy requires that significant effort would be made to identify and mitigate impacts to potential archeological resources prior to ground disturbance. Implementation Program 12 requires discovery procedures for archaeological resources found during grading, excavation, or construction in any area. However, because the presence of significant archaeological resources is typically unknown until the resource is uncovered, which often occurs during ground disturbing activities, adverse effects may occur prior to discovery of the archaeological resources. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Noise and Vibration

Impact 4.8-1: Increase in exterior noise levels above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses (per Table EC-1).

Applicable Policies: EC 3.1.1, EC 3.1.2, EC 3.1.8 EC 3.1.11, EC 3.2.1, EC 3.2.2, and LU 2.7.5, M 7.1.4, M7.1.6, NS.LU 1.5, NS.LU 1.29, SN.PHS 1.2, SA.EC 1.3, and SA.FTV 1.4. Policies EC 3.1.1 and EC 3.1.2 establish the City's exterior noise standards. Policy EC 3.1.8 requires mixed-use, commercial, and industrial development to mitigate operational noise impacts to adjoining sensitive uses. Policy EC 3.1.11 encourages design strategies and other noise reduction methods along transportation corridors in lieu of sound walls. Policies EC 3.2.1 and EC 3.2.2 promote land use compatibility near airports. Policy LU 2.7.5 addresses noise along freeways by requiring landscaping and trees along freeway frontage and inclusion of design elements to reduce noise. Policy

M.7.1.4 and M.7.1.6 minimize train and truck noise. North Sacramento Community Plan Policies NS. LU 1.5 and 1.29 require avoiding placement of noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to heavy rail lines and prohibiting residential development within the 65 CNEL McClellan Airport noise exposure contour and requiring conditions to residential development between the 60 and 65 CNEL contours. South Natomas Community Plan Policy SN. PHS 1.2 requires notification of the County Department of Airports for applications for residential entitlements west of I-5.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Implementation of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies would, in most cases, substantially reduce the exterior noise levels and/or increments on future noise-sensitive land uses that could be developed under the proposed 2035 General Plan. However, there may be specific situations for which the noise levels cannot be fully reduced below City standards. In addition, the proposed policies would not substantially reduce the noise effects on many existing noise-sensitive land uses in areas with current high noise exposures or where substantial noise increases are expected. For new development, City noise standards could typically be met and substantial noise increases could be avoided by incorporating standard noise-reducing features. However, it would not be possible to assure achievement of all noise standards. Noise levels associated with certain projects, including those with noise sensitivities or non-typical noise-generating sources, such as residential development located adjacent to rail transit facilities or an open-air sports stadium, may not be reduced below City standards. For existing residences located in areas adjacent to roadways or other noise generating sources, it may not be feasible (e.g., there are no means for which the City can require existing development to comply with increasing noise levels as a result of future development) to include noise reduction strategies to address an increase in noise levels. Thus, some new development may be located in areas with high noise generation where implementation of all feasible mitigation would not fully reduce exterior noise levels below the City's noise standards, and existing sensitive uses could be exposed to noise increases associated with growth under the proposed General Plan, such as increased roadway, rail, and air traffic. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Impact 4.8-2: Increase in residential interior noise levels of L_{dn} 45 dB or greater.

Applicable Policies: EC 3.1.3, EC 3.1.4, EC 3.2.1. Policies EC 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 establish the City's interior noise standards and requirements for interior noise review. Policy EC 3.2.1 restricts new residential development within the 65 dBA CNEL airport noise contour, or in accordance with plans prepared by the Airport

Land Use Commission, and the City shall only approve noise-compatible land uses.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Implementation of the proposed policies would substantially reduce interior noise impacts on future (new) noise-sensitive (residential) land uses that could be developed under the proposed General Plan. However, similar to Impact 4.8-1, there may be specific situations for which the noise levels cannot be fully reduced below City standards. In addition, the policies would not substantially reduce the noise effects on existing noise-sensitive land uses that are currently exposed to high levels of noise. Many of the existing noise-sensitive uses were constructed prior to building code requirements for modern noise-reducing building design, which can achieve substantial exterior-to-interior noise attenuation. Growth associated with implementation of the proposed 2035 General Plan would generally increase noise within the Policy Area, due to increased road traffic, rail traffic, air traffic, and construction. For new development it is anticipated that many City standards could be met and substantial noise increases could be avoided by incorporating noise-reducing features. However, noise levels associated with certain projects, especially those with non-typical noise issues, may not be able to be reduced below City standards. For existing residences located in areas adjacent to roadways or other noise-generating sources, it may not be possible or feasible to include noise reduction strategies to address an increase in interior noise levels due to lack of access or the inability to assure upgrades would be made to the residences (e.g., there are no means for which the City can require existing development to comply with increasing noise levels as a result of future development). Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Impact 4.8-4: Exposure of existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to construction.

Applicable Policies: EC 3.1.5 and EC 3.1.6. Policy EC 3.1.5 requires construction projects anticipated to generate a significant amount of vibration to reduce, to the extent feasible, interior vibration levels at nearby residential and commercial uses based on the current City or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria. Policy EC 3.1.6 requires the City to consider potential effects of vibration when reviewing new residential and commercial projects that are proposed in the vicinity of rail lines or light rail lines.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Future construction activities that could occur under the proposed 2035

General Plan could have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration. Vibration-induced structural damage could be avoided in all cases by prohibiting any construction projects that have any potential for causing structural damage to nearby buildings, as determined by a pre-construction vibration assessment in accordance with City vibration damage criteria. Compliance with 2035 General Plan Policy EC 3.1.6 would help to reduce the significance of the impact. However, there is no assurance that all construction-induced impacts could be avoided if existing sensitive uses are very close (within 50 feet) of vibration-inducing construction activities such as pile driving or blasting. There is no guarantee that all construction within 50 feet of all existing receptors can be prohibited, and the potential remains for disruption/annoyance and structural damage due to vibration at certain receptors. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Public Utilities

Impact 4.11-2: Potential to result in an increase in demand for potable water in excess of the City's existing diversion and treatment capacity, which could require the construction of new water supply facilities.

Applicable Policies: U 1.1.1, U 1.1.5, U 1.1.6, U 2.1.3, U 2.1.9, and U 2.1.10. Policies U 1.1.1, U 1.1.5, and U 1.1.6 require adequate provision of utilities, ensuring appropriate timing and phasing of public facilities and service to coincide with approved urban development, and requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share without impacting service levels. Policy U 2.1.3 requires the City to plan, secure funding for, and procure sufficient water treatment capacity and infrastructure to meet projected water demands. Policy U 2.1.9 requires the City to ensure that water supply capacity is in place prior to granting building permits for new development. Policy U 2.1.10 requires the City to achieve a 20 percent reduction in per-capita water use by 2020 consistent with the State's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Several proposed General Plan policies call for the City to plan and provide a reliable water service to serve all city residents. Policy U 2.1.3 would ensure the City provides sufficient funding to meet the projected water demand and Policy U 2.1.9 would prevent the City from granting building permits without sufficient water supply capacity. Implementation of these policies would ensure that development does not outstrip the availability of adequate water diversion and treatment capacity to meet the water demand for such development. There also is a policy in the proposed 2035 General Plan that seeks to reduce peak day water demand (Policy U 2.1.10). Policy U 2.1.11 requires the City to implement water conservation programs, which could help reduce the peak day demand.

However, even if high levels of conservation are achieved, future water demand associated with implementation of the proposed 2035 General Plan still would exceed the City's existing available water diversion and treatment capacity at some point in time. The City is also considering other options to increase water treatment capacity. These include:

- ▲ Construction of a new water treatment plant on the Sacramento River in Natomas, north of the City's present SRWTP, within the vicinity of Sacramento International Airport, commonly called the Natomas Water Treatment Plant (NTWP).
- ▲ Construction of a raw water pipeline to pump flow back from the Sacramento River to the FWTP for treatment and distribution, commonly called the Pumpback.
- ▲ The expansion of the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant.

The Department of Utilities has indicated that selection of any of these options would provide sufficient water treatment capacity to meet the projected demand for 2035 buildout. The City has not yet determined which of these options should be implemented. It is likely that implementation of any of these options would result in significant environmental effects, such as those relating to biological resources, cultural resources, water quality, construction noise, and visual resources, among others. None of these plans have been designed, funded or approved, and specific environmental analysis cannot be conducted. However, CEQA review will be required for any water treatment option proposed and project-specific impacts will be evaluated and mitigation measures required to reduce significant impacts to the extent feasible. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.12-3: Potential adverse effects to roadway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions resulting from planned development under the 2035 General Plan, such that the jurisdictions minimum acceptable level-of-service thresholds are not met.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, and M 1.4.2. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and

SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measure 4.12-1: Widen 47th Avenue from 4 to 6 lanes.

Finding: Using County of Sacramento level of service (LOS) standards, one of the 42 roadway segments located in unincorporated Sacramento County would be impacted by implementation of the 2035 General Plan conditions. The LOS for the segment of 47th Avenue between SR 99 and Stockton Boulevard would deteriorate to LOS F. Widening the segment of 47th Avenue between SR 99 and Stockton Boulevard from 4 lanes to 6 lanes would mitigate this impact by improving operations on this segment to LOS B. This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Because this segment of 47th Avenue is a county road and does not fall within the City's jurisdiction, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure. This mitigation measure is also not consistent with the County of Sacramento's General Plan and may be infeasible due to physically constrained right-of-way. This section of 47th Avenue is highly urbanized; however, vacant land does exist along this alignment, as well as drainage features. Potential impacts could include construction-related pollutant emissions, impacts to special-status wildlife species and wetlands, impacts related to water quality, impacts to historic and archaeological resources, impacts related to construction noise and traffic noise, land use impacts, and potential displacement of existing land uses. It is possible that mitigation measures are available to reduce most of these impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, this project would require additional CEQA analysis at the time it is proposed by Sacramento County, and the CEQA analysis could identify significant impacts that may not be able to be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

Impact 4.12-4: Potential impacts to freeway segments.

Applicable Policies: M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, M 1.4.2, M 1.5.6, M 1.5.7, M 4.1.5. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips. Policy M 1.5.6 supports State highway expansion consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS. Policy 1.5.7 requires the City to work with Caltrans and adjacent jurisdictions to identify funding for improvements that address cumulative effects of planned development on the freeway

system. Policy M 4.1.5 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and other agencies in the context of multimodal corridor planning to determine the appropriate responsibilities to fund, evaluate, plan, design, construct, and maintain new river crossings.

Mitigation Measures: none available.

Finding: Implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in potentially significant traffic impacts—based on the Caltrans LOS threshold and related significance standards—for fifteen freeway segments. Implementation of policy M 1.5.6 would require that the City support State highway expansion and management plans consistent with the SACOG MTP/SCS. All freeway improvement projects contained in the MTP/SCS were incorporated into the 2035 General Plan transportation analysis. In addition, implementation of Program 17 would require creation of a City development impact fee program that would fund multi-modal projects that would further alleviate congestion on the freeway segments identified above. However, the extent to which these impacts would be alleviated by City impact fee policies cannot be determined at this point, because this would be a new fee program. Since Caltrans has the decision-making authority on implementing improvements to the above freeway segments, the City of Sacramento cannot guarantee implementation and/or the timing of State highway improvements. It is also not certain that improvements to State highways have been identified that would substantially reduce impacts to all of these freeway segments. Feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available. **For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.**

E. Findings Related to the Relationship Between Local Short-term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity.

Based on the MEIR and the entire record before the City Council, the City Council makes the following findings with respect to the project's balancing of local short term uses of the environment and the maintenance of long term productivity:

1. As the project is implemented, certain impacts would occur on a short-term level. Such short-term impacts are discussed above. Where feasible, measures have been incorporated in the project to mitigate these potential impacts.

2. The project would result in the long-term commitment of resources to develop and operate the project including water, natural gas, fossil fuels, and electricity. The long-term implementation of the project would provide economic benefits to the City. The project would encourage infill development within the existing urban area and not contribute to urban sprawl. Notwithstanding the foregoing, some long-term impacts would result.

Although there are short-term and long-term adverse impacts from the project, the short-term and long-term benefits of the project justify implementation.

F. Project Alternatives.

The City Council has considered the Project alternatives presented and analyzed in the final EIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. Some of these alternatives have the potential to avoid or reduce certain significant or potentially significant environmental impacts, as set forth below. The City Council finds, based on specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, that these alternatives are infeasible. Each alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each alternative are set forth below.

Alternatives Considered and Dismissed from Further Consideration

Alternatives from 2009 MEIR for the 2030 General Plan

Several Alternatives were considered and dismissed in the City's 2009 MEIR for the 2030 General Plan. These alternatives include:

- ▲ Less Dense Development,
- ▲ Growth Limited by Water Supply,
- ▲ Higher Density, and
- ▲ Expanded City Limits.

Because of the similarity between the 2030 General Plan and the 2035 General Plan, and for many of the same reasons stated in the 2009 MEIR, the Alternatives considered and dismissed for the 2030 General Plan were also dismissed from further consideration in the MEIR for the 2035 General Plan.

The 2009 MEIR for the 2030 General Plan considered three alternatives for further evaluation. The MEIR for the 2035 General Plan considered and dismissed two of these alternatives, as described below:

- **No Project/1988 General Plan.** This alternative assumed that development would be guided by the previously adopted 1988 General Plan. This Alternative was dismissed from further consideration in the 2035 General Plan MEIR because the 2030 General Plan superseded the 1988 General Plan at the time of adoption. The No Project Alternative for the 2035 General Plan MEIR (discussed further below) assumed development would continue under the existing 2030 General Plan.
- **SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario.** This alternative assumed a general plan with principles and densities consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario. This alternative was dismissed from further consideration, because it essentially duplicates the 2035 General Plan, which is substantially consistent

with the current SACOG MTP/SCS (2012). The MTP/SCS updated and implemented the Blueprint. Therefore, this alternative was too similar to the 2035 General Plan for an informative comparison.

The third alternative considered in the 2009 MEIR, “The Reduced Footprint Alternative”, was evaluated in detail in the Draft MEIR for the 2035 General Plan and is discussed further below.

No Additional River Crossings

Several river crossings were identified as subsequent projects in Table 2-2 of the MEIR. Each of the river crossings is listed below:

- Lower American River Crossing (between downtown Sacramento and South Natomas);
- Sutter’s Landing Bridge (between American River Parkway and Sutter’s Landing Park);
- Truxel Road Bridge (between South Natomas and the River District);
- Sacramento River Crossing (between Sacramento and West Sacramento at either Broadway or Marina View Drive); and
- Sacramento River Crossing (between Sacramento and West Sacramento at Richards Boulevard or C Street).

Construction of these projects would likely involve construction on river banks and/or within the river channel and bed. Potentially significant and unavoidable impacts associated with these river crossings have been identified throughout this MEIR, including impacts to biological resources and visual resources. Eliminating these river crossings from the list of subsequent projects would also require removing these river crossings from the planned circulation network. Many of these river crossings include multi-modal facilities and are critical in the transportation plan for efficient and multi-modal movement, and movement of goods, throughout the city and into other cities and adjacent areas. This could result, not only in ramifications related to air quality and GHG emissions from increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but also in adverse economic effects related to decreased efficiency in goods movement and adverse effects to auto and alternative transportation within the city. This Alternative was, therefore, eliminated from further consideration, because it would not meet the City’s objectives related to economic vitality and sustainability and public health associated with pedestrian and bicycle movement. This alternative would also disrupt a long-term and coordinated planning effort with other agencies, including West Sacramento and SACOG.

No Project/No Development

The No Project/No Development Alternative describes the environmental

conditions that exist at the time that the environmental analysis commences (CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.6 (e) (2)). This alternative would result in ceasing future development within the city. By stopping all future development, this alternative would reduce the demand for public infrastructure and services, reduce impacts on environmental resources, such as air quality, noise, biological, and cultural resources, and dramatically reduce traffic impacts relative to the proposed project as well as the contribution to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. However, while a No Development Alternative may be an option for an individual development project, eliminating all future development in the city would not be a realistic or feasible general plan alternative. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is not considered further.

Summary of Alternatives Considered

No Project/2030 General Plan Alternative

The Draft MEIR analyzes a No Project alternative that assumes development would occur consistent with the existing land use designations in the city, or those of the existing 2030 General Plan (as currently amended). Under the No Project/2030 General Plan Alternative, the Policy Area would be developed consistent with currently allowable land uses and development intensities. It is assumed that the existing General Plan policies would remain in place under this alternative. Because the proposed 2035 General Plan includes no proposed changes to the current 2030 General Plan Land Use and Urban Form Diagram, the overall buildout of the city under the current 2030 General Plan would be substantially similar to the buildout of the proposed 2035 General Plan, although minor changes to the allowed densities would result in slightly higher density in the proposed 2035 General Plan than the current 2030 General Plan. The proposed 2035 General Plan includes policies incorporated from the adopted CAP that promote energy efficiency and reduced VMT. Other important proposed policies include applying a LOS “exemption” (allowing LOS F) to all three priority investment areas (PIAs) and LOS E and F to specified roadways, as well as more aggressive flood protection policies.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

The 2030 General Plan Alternative greatly advanced the City’s objectives for smart growth, sustainability, and health beyond the 1988 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan further advances these objectives by incorporating the City’s CAP into the policies of the General Plan, further focusing development into the City’s core and priority investment areas, and facilitating more sustainable, multi-modal transportation infrastructure. Implementing the No Project/2030 General Plan Alternative would not further the City’s objectives in these areas. The No Project/2030 General Plan Alternative would generally result in greater impacts than the proposed project and would not avoid any significant impacts associated with the project.

Increased Transit Corridor Development

This alternative would involve changes to the current/proposed Land Use and Urban Form Diagram to adjust land use designations associated with existing and planned transit centers to increase the development potential of those centers and corridors. Growth assumptions would remain the same as under the proposed 2035 General Plan; however, this increase in planned intensity would concentrate growth closer to transit than under the proposed 2035 General Plan. Under this alternative, transit-oriented development would be further promoted and citywide VMT would likely decrease due to increased access to transit. The policies under the alternative would be the same as the proposed 2035 General Plan.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

The Increased Transit Corridor Development Alternative would meet the City's project objectives. However, the Alternative would not avoid any of the significant impacts associated with the proposed 2035 General Plan. Under this alternative, regional transit investments beyond those currently envisioned may be needed to support substantially increased transit corridor density. The feasibility of securing a higher level of transit investments is not currently known.

Reduced Footprint Alternative

Significant effects on biological resources, cultural resources, and hazards would be substantially reduced by reducing the footprint of development compared to the proposed 2035 General Plan. The Reduced Footprint Alternative, therefore, assumes that Panhandle and Camino Norte areas would not be included within the Policy Area boundaries and would not be annexed or developed. This alternative assumes the boundaries would remain the same as the existing city boundaries. This alternative also assumes that the population projected for the proposed 2035 General Plan would still be accommodated within these boundaries. Because there are a limited number of undeveloped areas available for development remaining in the existing city limits, those remaining areas would have to be developed more densely than is anticipated in the proposed 2035 General Plan. In addition, because the increase in density in currently undeveloped areas could not accommodate the growth planned in the proposed 2035 General Plan, a substantial amount of redevelopment would have to occur in the city to maximize density on underutilized parcels. It is assumed that the Reduced Footprint Alternative would include the same policies as the proposed 2035 General Plan. The MEIR identified the Reduced Footprint Alternative as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Because the increase in density in currently undeveloped areas could not accommodate the growth planned in the proposed 2035 General Plan, a substantial amount of redevelopment would have to occur in the city to maximize density on underutilized parcels. Although reinvestment in currently underutilized parcels is a key aspect to achieving the project's objectives, it is anticipated that

the amount of redevelopment required to make this alternative work would be impossible to achieve.

G. Statement of Overriding Considerations:

Pursuant to Guidelines section 15092, the City Council finds that in approving the Project it has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant and potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment where feasible, as shown in the MEIR and described in these Findings. The City Council further finds that it has balanced the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project against the remaining unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the Project and has determined that those benefits outweigh the unavoidable environmental risks and that those risks are acceptable. The City Council makes this statement of overriding considerations in accordance with section 15093 of the Guidelines in support of approval of the Project.

In the City Council's judgment, the Project and its benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects.

Any one of the stated reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason set forth in this Statement is supported by substantial evidence, the City Council finds that any individual reason is separately sufficient. This Statement is supported by the substantial evidence set forth in the Draft MEIR, Final MEIR, the Findings set forth above, and in the documents contained in the administrative record referenced above.

1. **Achieving the City's Vision.** The 2035 General Plan is a long-range planning document that establishes a framework for the City to achieve its vision to be the most livable city in America. The Project is a guide for both the development of lands within the City Limits and resource preservation for areas beyond the city. It contains the policy framework necessary to fulfill the City's objectives to protect important environmental resources, and that ensure long-term economic sustainability and health, equity, and social well-being for the entire community. The 2035 General Plan establishes new goals and policies for regulating development projects and for balancing population and employment growth with infrastructure availability, natural resource protection, and enhanced quality of life. Other goals and policies are directed to resource protection, ensuring the timely availability of public infrastructure and services, encouraging a well-balanced economy, preserving and enhancing residential neighborhoods, maintaining an extensive urban forest, and strengthening the city's role as the center of Sacramento region. While the previous General Plan served the City well since its 2009 adoption, the 2035 General Plan reflects changed conditions and priorities, streamlines development review and implementation, and addresses new state laws. The Plan reflects housing, employment, and

population projections consistent with SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan and an extension of the planning horizon to 2035. The 2035 General Plan also integrates new planning concepts endorsed by the City Council, and translates the updated goals and policies into implementation programs (such as amendments to the City's Development Code) to assure that the City's vision is implemented.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to provide a policy framework for achieving the City's vision outweighs its environmental impacts.

2. **Focusing Growth Inward.** The 2035 General Plan includes goals and policies designed to continue encouraging future growth in the city inward into existing urbanized and underutilized areas and the Central City over expanding outwards into "greenfields" on the edge of the city. It maintains a Land Use and Urban Form Diagram that facilitates infill development and compact development patterns. It continues goals and policies that allow for and encourage higher densities and intensities and a mix of uses within neighborhoods, corridors, and centers. The Project provides opportunity for future development to integrate housing with commercial, office, and entertainment uses, therefore reducing residents' need to travel far for goods and services or jobs. The Project also establishes a land use pattern that furthers SACOG's regional vision expressed in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, which seeks to increase walking, biking, and transit use and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to focus growth inward, result in a more compact, higher density pattern of development, and mix uses in a complementary fashion outweighs its environmental impacts.

3. **Preserving Open Space, Agriculture, and Biological and Habitat Resources.** Approval and implementation of the 2035 General Plan would protect natural resources and preserve agricultural lands by managing urban development due to population growth and directing most growth to areas within the current City Limits, therefore avoiding a lower-density, sprawling, and scattered development pattern. The Plan also includes goals and policies designed to prevent and compensate for the loss of important farmlands. The 2035 General Plan includes new goals and policies that encourage urban agriculture activities. It would act to protect biological resources and sensitive habitats by managing urban development due to population growth and directing growth to areas within the existing City limits. The 2035 General Plan also includes new goals and policies to promote urban agriculture, in order to support the production and sale of locally grown foods, as well as improve public health and well-being, increase public awareness, and community-building, particularly in areas that have vacant or underutilized land.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to preserve open space, agriculture, and biological resources and habitats outweighs its environmental impacts.

4. **Increasing Water Conservation.** The 2035 General Plan provides new goals, policies, and programs that address the use of water by reducing overall water consumption and maintaining water supplies and water quality. Both surface water and groundwater supplies are important determinants of future growth of the city. The 2035 General Plan includes policies and implementation programs to reduce water consumption by new development from current rates of consumption, to coordinate water planning and management among the water purveyors, and encourages the most efficient uses and sources of water to maintain adequate water supplies.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to protect water resources and increase water conservation outweighs its environmental impacts.

5. **Improving Mobility and Access.** The 2035 General Plan continues goals and policies that improve the mobility and access of both persons and goods throughout the city and the region. It promotes alternative forms of transportation (e.g., transit, bicycle, pedestrian) in order to reduce commute times and vehicle congestion, improves air quality, and facilitates a healthier community. The 2035 General Plan includes a policy shift that maximizes the efficiency of the roadway network for all transportation modes while minimizing potential negative impacts. These objectives are balanced by maintaining citywide traffic expectations at LOS D while identifying areas and streets where other community values are more important than maximizing traffic flow. These new areas include Priority Investment Areas, where transit use, walking and biking are prioritized and where there is not sufficient space to widen

roadways. Additionally, streets projected to have LOS E or F by 2035 are not required to operate at LOS D. The Project also allows the City to require applicable vehicle trip reduction measures and physical improvements that increase transit use, bicycling, or walking, reduce adverse operational traffic impacts, and improve mobility and access for residents.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to reduce vehicle miles traveled and provide alternative travel options outweighs its environmental impacts.

6. **Reducing the City's Carbon Footprint.** The Project includes a variety of goals, policies, and implementation programs that continue the City's ongoing commitment to reduce carbon emissions that contribute to global warming, both in its municipal operations and at the community-wide scale. These goals, policies, and implementation programs call for specific actions that would apply to both existing development and new development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan. Examples of these actions include: implementation of "green" building practices in both new construction and retrofits to existing buildings, increased use of solar photovoltaic and other renewable energy systems, increased investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and complete streets, increased community recycling and waste diversion, water and wastewater conservation, and compact infill development in mixed-use areas near transit that facilitate walking, biking, and use of public transit. The 2035 General Plan is intended to ensure that the City comes into and remains in compliance with the directives of Assembly Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, as that law is implemented by the California Air Resources Board and other entities over time. The 2035 General Plan will also position the City favorably to remain in conformance with the Sustainable Communities Strategy adopted by SACOG pursuant to SB 375. Adoption of the 2035 General Plan will put these key strategies in place immediately to move the City and the region toward a more sustainable future.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to reduce greenhouse gas emissions outweighs its environmental impacts.

7. **Providing Needed Economic Development for the City.** The 2035 General Plan includes a land use plan and specific goals and policies that support a diversity of business and employment opportunities. It seeks to retain existing businesses and establishes long-term strategies to attract new businesses through higher levels of educated residents; enhanced and expanded recreational, arts, and cultural amenities and a diversity of community events and celebrations; safer neighborhoods and employment centers; and provision of necessary infrastructure. The 2035 General Plan identifies ways the City of Sacramento can diversify its economy and attract new industries, such as those anticipated as part of the green economy.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to expand economic opportunities outweighs its environmental impacts.

8. **Increasing Safety from Hazards.** The 2035 General Plan includes new goals, policies, and implementation programs that seek to reduce residents and property risk from flooding. Recent State legislation (i.e., SB 5 and AB162) requires the City to improve local land use decisions by strengthening the link between land use and flood management “for the consideration of flood hazards, flooding, and floodplains” to address flood risks. In compliance with recent State legislation, the 2035 General Plan adds additional policies and maps to address flood risks and higher standards for flood protection consistent with State law. The new goals, policies, and implementation measures will help minimize flood-related impacts to existing and new city residents and essential public facilities. Policies proposed under the 2035 General Plan include levee requirements, new development evaluations, and flood management planning efforts, all resulting in a minimum flood protection standard of a 200-year event. It requires new development to be reasonably safe from flooding and consistent with California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria. The Plan sets forth policies to protect levees and other flood protection facilities. It also sets forth implementation programs that ensure the City will update local ordinances and conduct necessary studies to ensure new development is not planned in unprotected areas and to provide for the improvement and maintenance of flood protection facilities.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to reduce the risk of flooding outweighs its environmental impacts.

9. **Enhancing Residents’ Health and Quality of Life.** The 2035 General Plan includes goals and policies that create more livable neighborhoods through increased safety, better access to healthy foods, and opportunities for exercise through increased focus on pedestrian and bicycle mobility. The 2035 General Plan includes a Land Use and Urban Form Diagram and Circulation Diagram that continue to preserve and enhance land use patterns and densities that foster pedestrian and bicycle use and recreation through expanded parklands, sports, and athletic programming as well as provide incentives for expanding the

availability of organic foods, and protecting residents from crime and natural disasters or terrorist acts. It also establishes goals and policies that seek to ensure equitable access for all residents to employment, housing, education, recreation, transportation, and services.

For the reasons set forth above, the City Council finds that the ability of the Project to improve residents' health and quality of life outweighs its environmental impacts.

10. The City Council has considered these benefits and considerations and has considered the potentially significant unavoidable environmental effects of the Project. The City Council has determined that the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project outweigh the identified impacts. The City Council has determined that the project benefits set forth above override the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the Project.

11. The City Council adopts the mitigation measure in the final Mitigation Monitoring Program, incorporated by reference into these Findings, and finds that any residual or remaining effects on the environment resulting from the Project, identified as significant and unavoidable in the Findings of Fact, are acceptable due to the benefits set forth in this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City Council makes this statement of overriding considerations in accordance with section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines in support of approval of the project.

2035 General Plan Master EIR

Mitigation Monitoring Program

NOTE: The Master EIR identified potentially significant effects that could occur with implementation of the 2035 General Plan. In most cases, the Master EIR identified general plan provisions that would reduce the identified impacts. The table below identifies the general plan provisions that were identified in the Master EIR as effectively reducing the respective impacts, and are, therefore, considered as being mitigation measures for CEQA purposes.

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
4.1 Agricultural Resources				
4.1-1 Conversion of important Farmland to a non-agricultural use	Policies ER 4.2-1, ER 4.2-2, and ER 4.2-3: These policies encourage infill development and compact new development to avoid the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses. Policy 4.2.3 calls for the City to cooperate with the County of Sacramento and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation lands.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.1-2: Incompatibility with surrounding agricultural operations outside the Policy Area.	Policies ER 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. These policies encourage infill development and compact new development to avoid the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses. Policy 4.2.3 calls for the City to cooperate with the County of Sacramento and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation lands.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.1-3: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural	Policies ER 4.1.1, ER 4.1.2, ER 4.2.1, ER 4.2.4. Policy ER 4.1.1 would incentivize provision of	City of Sacramento,	On-going	City of Sacramento

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
use or with a Williamson Act contract.	community gardens and rooftop gardens in new development projects. Policy ER 4.1.2 promotes opportunities for urban agriculture (community gardens) and recognizes their value in providing fresh food in urban areas in addition to their recreational, community building, landscaping, City of Sacramento, Community Development Department and educational value. Policy ER 4.2.1 encourages infill development and compact new development within the existing urban areas in order to prohibit the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands for urban uses.	Community Development Department		Community Development Department
4.2 Air Quality				
Impact 4.2-1: Potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of Sacramento Valley regional air quality planning efforts.	Policies ER 6.1.1 through ER 6.1.3. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.3 requires development projects to incorporate emissions reduction features to reduce emissions equal to 15% below the unmitigated emissions level.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.2-2: Potential to result in short-term construction-generated	Policies ER 6.1.1, ER 6.1.2, 6.1.15. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento	City of Sacramento, Community	On-going	City of Sacramento Community

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter.	Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.15 requires preference to be given to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and service contracts.	Development Department		Development Department
Impact 4.2-3: Potential to result in long-term operational emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter that could contribute to a violation of air quality standards.	Policies ER 6.1.1 through 6.1.3, 6.1.12 through 6.1.15. Policy ER 6.1.1 requires the City to work with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal air quality standards to protect residents from pollution-related health effects. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy 6.1.3 requires development projects to incorporate emissions reduction features to reduce emissions equal to 15% below the unmitigated emissions level. Policy ER 6.1.12 promotes reduced idling and trips, more efficient routing, and use of public transportation, carpooling, and alternate modes. Policy ER 6.1.13 requires the City to continue purchase of low-emission vehicles for the fleet and to use clean fuel sources for trucks and heavy equipment. Policy ER 6.1.14 encourages use of zero-emission	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	and low-emission vehicles, bicycles, and other non-motorized vehicles, and car-sharing programs by requiring sufficient and convenient infrastructure. Policy ER 6.1.1.15 requires preference to be given to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and service contracts.			
Impact 4.2-4: Potential for TAC emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors.	Policies LU 2.7.5, ER 6.1.2, and ER 6.1.4. Policy LU 2.7.5 promotes high quality of development character along freeway corridors and protects the public from adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration. Policy ER 6.1.2 requires review of proposed development projects to ensure feasible emissions reduction measures are incorporated. Policy ER 6.1.4 requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and will impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.2-5: Potential exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive odors	Policies LU 2.7.5, ER 6.1.4. Policy LU 2.7.5 promotes high quality of development character along freeway corridors and protects the public from adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration. Policy ER 6.1.4 requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and will impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
4.3 Biological Resources Impact 4.3-1: Potential impact to special-status plant species due to substantial degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of population or habitat below self-sustaining levels.	Policies ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.5, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-2: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status invertebrates.</p>	<p>Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p> <p>Policies ER 2.1.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-3: 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.</p>	<p>2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p> <p>Policies ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.7 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.3-4: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status amphibians and reptiles.</p>	<p>Policies ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.7 through ER 2.1.12, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.3-5: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status mammals.</p>	<p>Policies ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6 through ER 2.1.8, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. Policy ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p>			
Impact 4.3-6: Degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-	<p>Policies ER 1.1.6, ER 1.1.10, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.10 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy ER 1.1.6 requires control of the volume, frequency, duration and peak flows rate and runoff velocity</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
sustaining levels of special-status fish.	<p>from development projects to reduce downstream erosion and protect stream habitat. Policy ER 1.1.10 requires implementation of watershed awareness and other water-quality-related educational programs. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires habitat assessments for sensitive species, and, if habitat is present, focused/protocol-level surveys (or assumed presence of species) for any project requiring discretionary approval. Avoidance and/or mitigation would be developed with the applicable resource agency. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p>	Department		Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
Impact 4.3-7: Loss or modification of riparian habitat.	<p>Policies LU 1.1.1, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.5, ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17. Policy LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.2 requires preservation, protection, and access to designated open space areas along rivers, floodways, and floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-8: Impacts on state or federally protected wetlands and/or waters of the United States through direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption.</p>	<p>rehabilitate local natural resources.</p> <p>Policies LU 1.1.11, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.11, ER 2.1.12, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17.</p> <p>Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires that the City coordinate closely with state and federal resource agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-9: Loss of CDFW-defined sensitive natural communities, such as elderberry savanna, northern claypan vernal pool, and northern hardpan vernal pool.</p>	<p>2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.</p> <p>Policies LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, U 1.1.12, ER2.1.1, ER 2.1.3, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6, ER 2.1.7, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17, NN.LU 1.41, NN.U 1.2. Policy LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy U 1.1.12 requires location and design of utilities to avoid or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and habitats. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources. North Natomas Community Plan Policy NN.LU 1.41 allows 50% of the required landscape setback to be used as open space, recreation, or habitat preservation, and NN.U.1.2 provides for taking advantage of opportunities for recreation, open space, habitat, wetland enhancement, recreation and utility uses for drainage systems.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.3-10: Substantial reduction in the number of trees within the Policy Area.</p>	<p>Policies ER 2.1.1, ER 2.1.8, ER 3.1.1, ER 3.1.3, ER 3.1.8, EC 2.1.16. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 3.1.1 requires maintenance and implementation of an Urban Forest Management Plan. Policy ER 3.1.3 requires retention of City Heritage Trees, or where tree removal cannot be avoided, tree replacement or appropriate remediation. ER 3.1.8 requires the City to promote the importance and benefits of trees and the urban forest. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors.</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-11: Contribution to regional loss of special-status plant or wildlife species or their habitat.</p>	<p>Policies LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, LU 9.1.1, ER 2.2.1, ER 2.1.4, ER 2.1.6 through ER 2.1.13, ER 2.1.16, ER 2.1.17, ER 4.2.3. LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. . Policy ER 2.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.11 requires</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>the City to coordinate with State and Federal resources agencies to protect areas containing rare or endangered species. Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider potential impact on sensitive plant and wildlife species for each project and for habitat assessments to be conducted as needed. Policy ER 2.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.14 supports efforts to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts. Policy ER 2.1.15 supports active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce the impact of climate change stressors and improve resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources. Policy ER 4.2.3 requires the City to continue to work with the County and other adjacent jurisdictions to implement existing conservation plans to preserve prime farmland and critical habitat outside the city.</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.3-12: Contribution to regional loss of sensitive natural communities including wetlands and riparian habitat in the region.</p>	<p>Policies LU 1.1.1, LU 1.1.11, LU 9.1.1, U 1.1.12, ER 1.1.1, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.12 through ER 2.1.17, ER 4.2.3. LU 1.1.1 requires the City to be the regional leader in sustainable development and encourage compact, higher-density development that conserves land resources and protects habitat, among other benefits. Policy LU 1.1.11 allows development intensity at less than the minimum floor ratio to allow avoidance of environmental features, such as wetlands. Policy U 1.1.12 requires location and design of utilities to avoid or minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and habitats. Policy ER 1.1.1 requires conservation and, where feasible, creation or restoration of areas that provide important water quality benefits. Policy ER 2.1.1 encourages new development to preserve onsite natural resources. . Policy ER 2.1.2 requires preservation, protection, and access to designated open space areas along rivers, floodways, and floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species. Policy ER 2.1.3 promotes preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city. Policy ER 2.1.4 requires the City to retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources. Policy ER 2.1.5 requires the City to preserve the ecological integrity of waterways that support riparian</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>resources by preserving native plants and removing, to the extent feasible, invasive nonnative plants. Policy ER 2.1.1.6 requires preservation and protection of wetland resources, or mitigation of all adverse impacts in compliance with State and Federal regulations and on- or off-site permanent equivalent preservation. ER 2.1.1.7 would help preserve and protect grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species to the maximum extent feasible. If consistency with this policy is not feasible, impacts on these resources would be mitigated in compliance with state and federal regulations. . Policy ER 2.1.1.8 requires preservation and protection of oak woodlands and significant strands of oak trees. Policy ER 2.1.1.9 requires preservation and protection of undisturbed habitats that provide movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. Policy ER 2.1.1.12 requires that the City continue its participation and support of the policies in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) for the protection of sensitive species in the Natomas Basin. Policy ER 2.1.1.13 supports regional habitat conservation planning efforts. Policy ER 2.1.1.14 supports efforts to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts. Policy ER 2.1.1.15 supports active habitat restoration and enhancement to</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	reduce the impact of climate change stressors and improve resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space. Policy ER 2.1.16 supports natural-resource-related education programs for residents and visitors. Policy ER 2.1.17 encourages community volunteerism to help protect and rehabilitate local natural resources.			
4.4 Cultural Resources				
Impact 4.4-1: Change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.	Policies HCR.1.1.1 through 1.1.3, 2.1.1 through 2.1.17, 2.1.18, 3.1.1 through 3.1.4, and LU 1.1.5, 2.1.2, 2.1.8, 2.4.2, 2.6.5, ERC 5.1.4, 5.1.5, CC.HCR 1.1, 1.2. Policies HCR 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 maintains the City's status as a Certified Local Government (CLG), maintains a Preservation Office, Commission, and program to administer preservation programs, and maintains code provisions for a preservation program consistent with Federal and State requirements. Policies 2.1.1 through 2.1.17 ensure compliance with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws through identification of resources, consultation with appropriate organizations, agencies, and individuals, providing incentives and enforcing regulations, supporting pursuit of eligibility for listing, including preservation in planning efforts, maintaining all City-owned historic and cultural resources consistent with State and Federal law, seeking funding for surveys, consider demolition of historic resources as a last resort, develop compliance protocols to protect archaeological	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>and cultural resources, review and evaluate individual development projects to minimize impact on historic and cultural resources. Policies HRC 3.1.1 through 3.1.4 promote heritage tourism, explore public/private partnerships for preservation programs, provide historic and cultural resources information to the public. Policy LU 1.1.5 promotes infill development and ensures integrity of historic districts. Policy LU 2.1.2 preserves, protects, and enhances established neighborhoods. Policy LU 2.1.8 promotes infill development, reuse, rehabilitation, and reuse efforts that contribute positively to existing neighborhoods and surrounding areas. Policy LU 2.4.2 requires building design that respects and responds to local context, including consideration of cultural and historic contexts. Policy LU 2.6.4 encourages retention of existing structures and promotes their adaptive reuse and renovation with green building technologies to retain the structures' embodied energy, increase energy efficiency, make it more energy efficient, and limit the generation of waste. Policies ERC 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 maintain and protect Historic City Cemetery and Old Sacramento Historic District. Central City Community Plan Policy CCHCR 1.1 and 1.2 require support programs for preservation of historically and architecturally significant properties and continuation of the development of historic "Old Sacramento" as a major tourist, entertainment, and cultural area in the region.</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
Impact 4.4-2: Change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.	<p>Policies HCR.1.1.1 through 1.1.3, 2.1.1 through 2.1.6, 3.1.1 through 3.1.4, and ERC 5.1.4. Policies HCR 1.1.1 through 1.1.3 maintains the City's status as a Certified Local Government (CLG), maintains a Preservation Office, Commission, and program to administer preservation programs, and maintains code provisions for a preservation program consistent with Federal and State requirements. Policies 2.1.1 through 2.1.6 ensure compliance with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws through identification of resources, consultation with appropriate organizations, agencies, and individuals, providing incentives and enforcing regulations, supporting pursuit of eligibility for listing, and including preservation in planning efforts. Policies HRC 3.1.1 through 3.1.4 promote heritage tourism, explore public/private partnerships for preservation programs, provide historic and cultural resources information to the public. Policies ERC 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 maintain and protect Historic City Cemetery and Old Sacramento Historic District.</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.5 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources				
Impact 4.5-1: Exposure of people to risk from seismic hazards, such as groundshaking and liquefaction.	<p>Policies PHS 3.1.8, EC 1.1.1, EC 1.1.2. Policy PHS 3.1.8 requires review of proposed facilities that would produce or store hazardous materials for seismic and geologic hazard, proximity to residential development, and the nature of the risk. Policies EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2 require the City to keep up-to-date records of seismic conditions,</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
Impact 4.5-2: Exposure of people to risk associated with unstable soil conditions, including expansive soils and subsidence.	<p>implement and enforces the most current building standards, and continue to require that site-specific geotechnical analyses be prepared for projects within the city and that report recommendations are implemented.</p> <p>Policies EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2. Policies EC 1.1.1 and EC 1.1.2 require the City to keep up-to-date records of seismic conditions, implement and enforces the most current building standards, and continue to require that site-specific geotechnical analyses be prepared for projects within the city and that report recommendations are implemented.</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.5-3: Potential to cause substantial soil erosion.	Policies EC 1.1.2 and ER 1.1.7. Policy EC 1.1.2 requires that each project within the city prepare a geotechnical investigation to determine site-specific seismic and soil characteristics and recommend appropriate mitigation measures to mitigate any potential impacts. Proposed Policy ER 1.1.7 requires that necessary erosion control measures are used during site development activities for all projects in the city.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.5-4: Loss of the availability of known mineral resources of State, regional, or local importance.	Policies ER 5.1.1, ER 5.1.2, ER 5.1.3. Policies ER 5.1.1 and ER 5.1.3 protect mineral extraction activities within the city from surrounding uses. For areas where future development could occur, proposed General Plan Policy ER 5.1.2 requires that future projects near mining activities are compatible with such activities and requires buffer and setbacks from areas classified as MRZ-	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	2.			
Impact 4.5-5: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.	Policy HCR 2.1.16. Policy HCR 2.1.1.16 requires the City to identify and protect paleontological resources in compliance with accepted protocols. Specifically, Implementation Program 13 requires amendment of the Sacramento Code to require discovery procedures for paleontological resources found during grading, excavation, or construction.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 4.6-1: Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities.	Policies LU 2.8.5, PHS 2.2.9, PHS 3.1.1, PHS 3.1.2, PHS 3.1.4, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.3 through 4.1.6. Policy LU 2.8.5 requires discouragement of establishment or expansion of potentially hazardous uses that have the potential to disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. Policy PHS 2.2.9 requires inclusion of emergency responders in the review of development proposals to ensure adequate emergency response times. Policy PHS 3.1.1 requires that buildings and sites under consideration for new development or redevelopment are investigated for the presence of hazardous materials prior to development activities. Policy PHS 3.1.2 requires that property owners of contaminated sites develop plans to investigate and manage hazardous material contamination to prevent risk to human health or	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.6-2: Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the General Plan.</p>	<p>the environment. Policy PHS 3.1.4 requires restriction of hazardous materials transport to designated routes. Policy PHS 4.1.1 requires maintenance and implementation of the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan to address disasters. Policy PHS 4.1.3 requires the City, in conjunction with other local, State, and Federal agencies, to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, conduct annual training for staff, and maintain, test, and update equipment to current standards. Policy PHS 4.1.4 requires coordination with local and regional jurisdictions to conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in mutual aid agreements to ensure adequate resources, facilities, and support for emergency response. Policy PHS 4.1.6 requires sponsorship and support of educational programs related to emergency response, disaster preparedness, and disaster risk reduction.</p> <p>Policies LU 2.8.5, LU 7.2.8, PHS 3.1.1 through 3.1.8, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.3 through PHS 4.1.6, PHS 5.1.8, EC 2.1.21, EC 2.1.23, SA.M 1.11, SA.M 1.12, SA.PHS 1.1, NS.LU 1.30. Policy LU 2.8.5 requires discouragement of establishment or expansion of potentially hazardous uses that have the potential to disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. Policy LU 7.2.8 requires industrial uses that use toxic or hazardous materials to be sited away from</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>existing or planned residential, commercial, or employment uses and to prepare Hazardous Substance Management Plans to limit contamination potential. Policy PHS 3.1.4 restricts transportation of hazardous materials to designated routes within the city to protect public safety. However, it is possible that small quantities of hazardous materials could be transported along roads throughout the city on a daily basis. Policy PHS 3.1.5 encourages clean industries within the city, while discouraging businesses that require onsite treatment of solid waste. With implementation of Policy PHS 3.1.6, future development of hazardous material treatment, storage, and disposal facilities would be consistent with the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan and compatible with nearby land uses. Policy PHS 3.1.7 requires continued education of residents and business regarding reduction or elimination of hazardous materials and products and encouragement for use of safer, nontoxic, environmentally friendly equivalents. Policy PHS 3.1.8 requires review of proposed facilities that would produce or store hazardous materials for seismic and geologic hazard, proximity to residential development, and the nature of the risk. The City would also maintain a Multi-Hazard Emergency Response Plan to address hazardous materials spills as required by Policy PHS 4.1.1. Policy PHS 4.1.3 requires the City, in conjunction with other local, State, and Federal agencies, to</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.6-3: Effects to emergency vehicle response times resulting from change in LOS standard.</p>	<p>ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, conduct annual training for staff, and maintain, test, and update equipment to current standards. Policy PHS 4.1.4 requires coordination with local and regional jurisdictions to conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in mutual aid agreements to ensure adequate resources, facilities, and support for emergency response. Policy PHS 4.1.6 requires sponsorship and support of educational programs related to emergency response, disaster preparedness, and disaster risk reduction. South Area Community Plan Policies SA.M 1.11 and 1.12 relate to airport safety and planning. SA.PHS 1.1 promotes emergency service coverage in the Valley Hi/North Laguna area. North Sacramento Community Plan Policy NS.LU 1.30 allows low intensity uses in proximity to airport safety zones associated with McClellan Airport operations.</p> <p>Policies M 1.3.3, M 4.1.1, M 4.2.6, PHS 1.1.2, PHS 1.1.4, PHS 1.1.5, PHS 2.1.2, PHS 2.1.4, PHS 2.1.5, PHS 2.1.7, PHS 4.1.5. Policies M 1.1.3, M 4.1.1 and M 4.2.6, prioritizes emergency service needs when developing transportation plans, making transportation network changes and creating new street configurations. Policies PHS 1.1.2 and PHS 2.1.2, to achieve and maintain optimal response times for police, fire, and emergency medical services. Policy PHS 4.1.5 requires participation in</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
4.7 Hydrology, Water Quality, and Flooding				
Impact 4.7-1: Potential to degrade water quality due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or operational activities.	Policies ER 1.1.1 through ER 1.1.10. Policies ER 1.1.1 – 1.1.10 require: the City to meet water quality requirements of the Phase 1 NPDES Permit; construction contractors to comply with erosion and sediment control and stormwater discharge regulations; watershed education to City staff; and preparation of watershed drainage plans.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.7-2: Potential to generate new sources of polluted runoff that could violate water quality standards.	Policies U 1.1.1 – 1.1.5; ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.6. Policies U1.1.1 through 1.1.5 require that the City provides and maintains adequate stormwater drainage utility services. Policies ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.10 implement measures to reduce post-construction increases in runoff rates, maintain agreements for selected on-site stormwater quality facilities through the development permit process, reduce use of chemicals applied for landscape use, provide recycling programs and facilities to prevent unauthorized dumping, and provide watershed education to City staff.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.7-3: Potential to increase exposure of the number of people and/or property to risk of injury and damage from a major flood	Policies U 4.1.1 through U 4.1.5, EC 2.1.2 through EC 2.1.16. Policies EC 2.1.1 through EC 2.1.28, and Implementation Programs 2 through 9 minimize flood-related impacts to existing and new city residents and essential public facilities. Most	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
event.	notably, Policy EC 2.1.13 requires the City to work with SAFCA to achieve by 2020 local-certification of levees for 200-year flood protection. And Policy EC 2.1.11 requires evaluation of potential flood hazards prior to City approval of development projects in order to determine whether the proposed development is reasonably safe from flooding and consistent with DWR Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria, which is the level of protection that is necessary to withstand a 200-year flood. The policy goes on to state that the City shall not approve new development or a subdivision or enter into a development agreement for any property within a flood hazard zone unless the adequacy of flood protection specific to the area has been demonstrated. Policy EC 2.1.28 requires the City to partner with relevant organizations and agencies when updating critical flood plans (including FEMA and DWR flood hazard maps; the City's Comprehensive Flood Management Plan; and the County-wide Local Hazard Mitigation Plan) to consider of the impacts of urbanization and climate change on long-term flood safety and long-term flood event probabilities.			
4.8 Noise and Vibration				
Impact 4.8-1: Increase in exterior noise levels above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various	Policies EC 3.1.1, EC 3.1.2, EC 3.1.8 EC 3.1.11, EC 3.2.1, EC 3.2.2, and LU 2.7.5, M 7.1.4, M7.1.6, NS.LU 1.5, NS.LU 1.29, SN.PHS 1.2, SA.EC 1.3, and SA.FTV 1.4. Policies EC 3.1.1 and EC 3.1.2 establish	City of Sacramento, Community Development	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
land uses (per Table EC-1).	<p>the City's exterior noise standards. Policy EC 3.1.8 requires mixed-use, commercial, and industrial development to mitigate operational noise impacts to adjoining sensitive uses. Policy EC 3.1.11 encourages design strategies and other noise reduction methods along transportation corridors in lieu of sound walls. Policies EC 3.2.1 and EC 3.2.2 promote land use compatibility near airports. Policy LU 2.7.5 addresses noise along freeways by requiring landscaping and trees along freeway frontage and inclusion of design elements to reduce noise. Policy M.7.1.4 and M.7.1.6 minimize train and truck noise. North Sacramento Community Plan Policies NS. LU 1.5 and 1.29 require avoiding placement of noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to heavy rail lines and prohibiting residential development within the 65 CNEL McClellan Airport noise exposure contour and requiring conditions to residential development between the 60 and 65 CNEL contours. South Natomas Community Plan Policy SN. PHS 1.2 requires notification of the County Department of Airports for applications for residential entitlements west of I-5.</p>	Department		Department
Impact 4.8-2: Increase in residential interior noise levels of L_{dn} 45 dB or greater.	<p>Policies EC 3.1.3, EC 3.1.4, EC 3.2.1. Policies EC 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 establish the City's interior noise standards and requirements for interior noise review. Policy EC 3.2.1 restricts new residential development within the 65 dBA CNEL airport noise contour, or in accordance with plans prepared by the Airport Land Use Commission,</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts					
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement	
	and the City shall only approve noise-compatible land uses.				
Impact 4.8-3: Potential for construction noise levels to exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance.	Policy EC 3.1.10. Policy EC 3.1.10 requires proponents of development projects to assess potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses and to minimize impacts on these uses, to the extent feasible.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department	
Impact 4.8-4: Exposure of existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to construction.	Policies EC 3.1.5 and EC 3.1.6. Policy EC 3.1.5 requires construction projects anticipated to generate a significant amount of vibration to reduce, to the extent feasible, interior vibration levels at nearby residential and commercial uses based on the current City or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria. Policy EC 3.1.6 requires the City to consider potential effects of vibration when reviewing new residential and commercial projects that are proposed in the vicinity of rail lines or light rail lines.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department	
Impact 4.8-5: Exposure of residential and commercial areas to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to adjacent highway traffic and rail operations.	Policy EC 3.1.6. Policy EC 3.1.6 requires new residential and commercial projects located adjacent to major freeways, hard rail lines, or light rail lines to conduct a site-specific vibration study and implement all feasible mitigation, including design features, setbacks, and wall and window insulation. Implementation of this policy would limit vibration impacts and would ensure adherence to vibration guidelines.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department	
Impact 4.8-6: Exposure of	Policy EC 3.1.7. Policy EC 3.1.7 would ensure that	City of	On-going	City of	

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>historic buildings to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.</p>	<p>the City require an assessment of the damage potential of vibration-induced construction activities or proposed new light rail lines in close proximity to historic buildings and require all feasible mitigation measures be implemented to ensure no damage would occur, including setbacks, pre-drilling for piles, use of screw piles, and other best practices.</p>	<p>Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>		<p>Sacramento Community Development Department</p>
4.9 Parks and Recreation				
<p>Impact 4.9-1: Potential physical deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities due to increased use.</p>	<p>Policies ERC 2.1.1, ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8, ERC 2.2.11, ERC 2.2.17, ERC 2.2.18, ERC 2.4.1, ERC 2.4.2, ERC 2.5.1, ERC 2.5.4. Policy ERC 2.1.1 requires the City to develop and maintain a complete system of public parks and open space areas throughout Sacramento that provides opportunities for both passive and active recreation. Policies ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8 require maintenance and implementation of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan, appropriate timing of parks development, provision of accessible parks within one-half mile of residences, meeting service level standards and goals, exploring creative solutions to provide neighborhood park facilities, preservation and replacement of parks, and prioritization of park investment. Policy ERC 2.4.1 requires the City to maintain service levels to provide linear parks/parkways and trails/bikeways. Policy 2.4.2 requires coordination with local, regional, and State partners to manage, preserve, and enhance</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.9-2: Potential to increase need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p>	<p>the Sacramento and American River Parkways and other local waterways and riparian corridors. Policy ERC 2.5.4 requires the City to fund the costs of acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks and community and recreation facilities through land dedication, in lieu fees, and/or development impact fees.</p> <p>Policies ERC 2.1.1, ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8, ERC 2.2.11, ERC 2.2.17, ERC 2.2.18, ERC 2.4.1, ERC 2.4.2, ERC 2.5.1, ERC 2.5.4. Policy ERC 2.1.1 requires the City to develop and maintain a complete system of public parks and open space areas throughout Sacramento that provides opportunities for both passive and active recreation. Policies ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8 require maintenance and implementation of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan, appropriate timing of parks development, provision of accessible parks within one-half mile of residences, meeting service level standards and goals, exploring creative solutions to provide neighborhood park facilities, preservation and replacement of parks, and prioritization of park investment. Policy ERC 2.4.1 requires the City to maintain service levels to provide linear parks/parkways and trails/bikeways. Policy 2.4.2 requires coordination with local, regional, and State partners to manage, preserve, and enhance the Sacramento and American River Parkways and other local waterways and riparian corridors. Policy ERC 2.5.4 requires the City to fund the costs</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	of acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks and community and recreation facilities through land dedication, in lieu fees, and/or development impact fees.			
4.10 Public Services				
Impact 4.10-1: Potential need to construct new or expanded facilities related to the provision of police protection.	<p>Policies PHS 1.1.1 through PHS 1.1.7, PHS 1.1.12.</p> <p>Policy PHS 1.1.1 calls for the City to prepare a Police Master Plan to address staffing needs, facility needs, deployment strategies, and service goals. The Master Plan would be the guiding document for police services in the city. Policies PHS 1.1.2 and PHS 1.1.3 require that the City maintain optimum staffing levels and response times in order to provide quality police services to the community. Policy PHS 1.1.4 mandates that the City keep pace with all development and growth within the city and adequate facilities and staffing are available to serve residents prior to occupation of new development. Policies PHS 1.1.5 and PHS 1.1.12 also deal with the distribution and cooperative delivery of services to residents within the city to ensure optimal police response to all city residents. Policy PHS 1.1.6 seeks to co-locate police facilities with other City facilities, such as fire stations, when appropriate, to promote efficient use of space and efficient provision of police protection services within dense, urban portions of the city. Policy PHS 1.1.7 seeks to prevent crime by implementing Crime Prevention through Environmental Design</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.10-2: Potential need to construct new, or expand existing facilities related to the provision of fire protection.</p>	<p>strategies.</p> <p>Policies PHS 2.1.1.1 through PHS 2.1.7, PHS 2.1.10, PHS 2.2.4, PHS 2.2.7, PHS 2.2.8. Policy PHS 2.1.1.1 calls for the City to prepare a Fire Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan would be the guiding document for the provision of fire services in the city. Policies PHS 2.1.2 and PHS 2.1.3 require that the City maintain emergency response times and staffing levels to ensure optimal fire protection in the community. Policy PHS 2.1.4 further requires additional fire protection resources be supplied when a fire station/company experiences call volumes exceeding 3,500 in a year and Policy PHS 2.1.6 requires that new fire stations are located strategically throughout the city to provide optimum response times to all areas. Policies PHS 2.1.5 and PHS 2.1.7 require new development to set aside land for future fire stations and ensure that adequate fire protection and emergency medical response facilities, equipment, and staffing are available prior to occupation of new development and redevelopment areas. PHS 2.2.4 ensures that adequate water supplies, pressure, and infrastructure are available in infill and newly</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	developing areas. Policies PHS 2.2.7 and PHS 2.2.8 require that the City work to inform the SFD of potential wildland risks and impose a method to increase fire prevention. In addition, Policy PHS 2.1.10 requires that the City work with other agencies to provide regional cooperative delivery of fire protection and emergency medical services.			
Impact 4.10-3: Potential to impact schools due to generation of additional elementary, middle, and high school students.	Policies ERC 1.1.1 through ERC 1.1.3. Policies ERC 1.1.1 and ERC 1.1.2 encourages the City to work with school districts to ensure that schools are provided to serve all existing and future residents and constructed in the neighborhoods that they serve, in safe locations, and connected to surrounding uses by walkways, bicycle paths, and greenways. Policy ERC 1.1.3 suggests that schools be developed with joint uses to integrate recreational, cultural, and non-school related activities.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 10-4: Potential to impact higher education facilities due to generation of additional post-secondary students.	Policies ERC 1.1.5, ERC 1.1.7. Policy ERC 1.1.5 encourages the development, expansion, and upgrade of higher education facilities. Policy ERC 1.1.7 requires the City to cooperate with higher education systems to explore the possibility of a multi-university campus.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.10-5: Potential need to construct new or expanded	Policies ERC 3.1.1 through ERC 3.1.4, ERC 3.1.7. Policy ERC 3.1.1 requires that adequate library	City of Sacramento,	On-going	City of Sacramento

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>facilities related to the provision of library services.</p>	<p>services and facilities are maintained for all residents. Policies ERC 3.1.2 and ERC 3.1.4 address siting including locating libraries in higher density and infill areas, near arterials and transit routes, and in joint-operation with public and private agencies at locations such as school sites or community centers. These policies ensure that libraries are accessible to a wide range of people and are near major community gathering locations. Policy ERC 3.1.3 gives library construction priority to areas in the city that are underserved. Policy ERC 3.1.7 ensures that funding methods are explored jointly between the City and Sacramento Public Library Authority.</p>	<p>Community Development Department</p>		<p>Community Development Department</p>
<p>Impact 4.10-6: Potential need to construct new or the expanded emergency response facilities related to the provision of emergency services.</p>	<p>Policies PHS 4.1.1 through PHS 4.1.5, PHS 5.1.1.1. Policies PHS 4.1.1 through PHS 4.1.4 are aimed at ensuring that there is adequate disaster preparedness in the city. The City must maintain the Emergency Operations Plan that includes information on disaster preparedness, ensure the operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center, train staff and conduct emergency and disaster preparedness exercises to test operational and emergency plans, and sponsor and support educational programs pertaining to emergency response, disaster preparedness protocols and procedures, and disaster risk reduction. Policy PHS 4.1.5 ensures</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	that the City participate in mutual aid agreements to ensure that adequate resources, facilities, and other support is provided in the event of a disaster. Policy PHS 5.1.1 would help ensure that adequate human services and medical facilities are established in the city to serve the city population.			
4.11 Public Utilities				
Impact 4.11-1: Potential to increase demand for potable water beyond available supply.	Policies U 2.1.11 through 2.1.16, and U2.1.17. Policy U 2.1.11 requires implementation of conservation programs to increase water efficiency. Policy U2.1.12 continues the City's enforcement of water conservation measures. Policy U2.1.13 requires continued investigation of recycled water. Policy U.2.1.14 requires promotion of rain capture systems. Policy U2.1.14 requires the use of water-efficient landscaping in all new development. Policy U2.1.15 requires the use of native and climate appropriate plants; and U.2.17, which requires continued public education and outreach campaigns to promote water conservation. Implementation of these policies would reduce demand for potable water.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.11-2: Potential to result in an increase in demand for potable water in excess of the City's existing	Policies U 1.1.1, U 1.1.5, U 1.1.6, U 2.1.3, U 2.1.9, and U 2.1.10. Policies U 1.1.1, U 1.1.5, and U 1.1.6 require adequate provision of utilities, ensuring appropriate timing and phasing of public facilities	City of Sacramento, Community Development	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>diversion and treatment capacity, which could require the construction of new water supply facilities.</p>	<p>and service to coincide with approved urban development, and requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share without impacting service levels. Policy U 2.1.3 requires the City to plan, secure funding for, and procure sufficient water treatment capacity and infrastructure to meet projected water demands. Policy U 2.1.9 requires the City to ensure that water supply capacity is in place prior to granting building permits for new development. Policy U 2.1.10 requires the City to achieve a 20 percent reduction in per-capita water use by 2020 consistent with the State's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan.</p>	<p>Department</p>		<p>Department</p>
<p>Impact 4.11-3: Potential to generate additional wastewater and stormwater, which could require the expansion of existing conveyance facilities.</p>	<p>Policies U 1.1.1 through U 1.1.8, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.3, U 3.1.4, and U 4.1.1 through U 4.1.3. Policies U 1.1.1 through U 1.1.8 require adequate provision of utilities, establishment and maintenance of citywide utility service standards, provision of sustainable utility facilities and services, requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share cost, development and implementation of a utilities financing strategy, identification and prioritization of infill areas for infrastructure improvements, and supporting development of joint-use facilities. Policy U 3.1.2 requires design of public facilities and infrastructure to meet ultimate capacity needs. Policy U 3.1.3 requires development of design standards to reduce infiltration into new City-maintained sewer pipes. Policy U 3.1.4</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
Impact 4.11-4: Potential to require the need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities, which could adversely affect the environment.	<p>requires continuation of rehabilitation of the Combined Sewer System to decrease flooding and outflows or overflows. Policy U 4.1.1 that requires the City to ensure that all new drainage facilities are adequately sized to accommodate stormwater runoff. Policy U 4.1.2 requires the City to ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are designed pursuant to basin master plans and Policy U 4.1.3 states that the City shall coordinate with the County as well as other agencies in the development of regional stormwater facilities.</p> <p>Policies U 1.1.1 through U.1.1.8, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.3, U 3.1.4. Policies U 1.1.1 through U 1.1.8 require adequate provision of utilities, establishment and maintenance of citywide utility service standards, provision of sustainable utility facilities and services, requiring new development to provide adequate facilities or pay fair share cost, development and implementation of a utilities financing strategy, identification and prioritization of infill areas for infrastructure improvements, and supporting development of joint-use facilities. Policy U 3.1.2 requires design of public facilities and infrastructure to meet ultimate capacity needs. Policy U 3.1.3 requires development of design standards to reduce infiltration into new City-maintained sewer pipes. Policy U 3.1.4 requires continuation of rehabilitation of the Combined Sewer System to decrease flooding and outflows or overflows.</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
Impact 4.11-5: Potential to result in the construction of new solid waste facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	Policies U 5.1.1 through U 5.1.25. Policies 5.1.1 requires the city to achieve zero waste to landfills by 2040 through reusing, reducing, and recycling solid waste, and in the interim, achieve a waste reduction goal of 75% diversion by 2020 over 2005 levels and 90% diversion by 2030. Policies 5.1.2 through 5.1.4 require continued coordination with the County in providing long-term disposal capacity and GHG reduction, provision of adequate transfer station facilities, and ensuring equitable distribution of solid waste and recycling facilities. The programs provided through Policies U 5.1.5 to U 5.1.13 are designed to ensure the City continues to provide recycling and clean-up services for its residents and businesses. Many of these programs are already in place, and continue to promote waste diversion, which will help reduce waste flow to landfills. Policies U.5.1.15 to U.5.1.21 provide long-term objectives for minimizing the city's contribution to solid waste by providing additional encouragement and education regarding recycling and development of new techniques for solid waste disposal. Policies U5.1.22 through U5.1.25 promote composting and vermiculture, education and outreach related to composting, support Solid Waste Authority's Sacramento Greencycle effort, and sponsor educational programs regarding benefits of solid waste diversion and recycling.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Impact 4.11-6: Potential to require or result in the	Policies U 6.1.1 through U 6.1.17. Policies U 6.1.1 through U 6.1.4 require the City to work closely	City of Sacramento,	On-going	City of Sacramento

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>construction of new energy production or transmission facilities.</p>	<p>with local utility providers to ensure adequate provision of electricity and natural gas, reduction of peak electric load by 10% by 2020 compared to 2004, reduction of fleet GHG emissions by 75% by 2020 compared to 2005, and improve energy efficiency of City facilities by 25% by 2030 compared to 2005. Policy U 6.1.5 would encourage new and existing residential and commercial developers to use renewable and recyclable energy and consume 25 percent less energy compared to the baseline year of 2005. Policies U 6.1.6 through U 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would help reduce the cumulative impacts associated with non-renewable energy sources. Standards and incentives related to energy-efficiency proposed by Policies U 6.1.10 through U 6.1.13 would have a lasting positive effect on the cumulative impacts in the Policy Area. Policies U 6.1.11 through U 6.1.17 require energy efficiency improvements, incentives, partnerships, and education.</p>	<p>Community Development Department</p>		<p>Community Development Department</p>
<p>Impact 4.11-7: Potential to require the construction of new or expansion of existing telecommunication facilities.</p>	<p>Policies U 7.1.1 through U 7.1.8. Policies U 7.1.1, U 7.1.2, U 7.1.4, and U 7.1.6 would allow the City to work closely with telecommunications providers to maintain necessary service levels while regulating development of new facilities. Policy U 7.1.2 would ensure utility companies retrofit areas that do not have facilities that meet current telecommunication technologies and provide strategies for long-range planning of</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	telecommunication facilities for new development areas. Additionally, Policy U 7.1.6 specifically requires the City to implement state-of-the-art internal telecommunication facilities and software in large scale planned communities and office and commercial developments. Policies U 7.1.3 and U 7.1.4 address future advances in telecommunication, and ensure that utility providers within the city would be encouraged to maintain state-of-the-art facilities and practices, including those that help minimize demand for telecommunication services and, subsequently, construction of new facilities.			
4.12 Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 4.12-1: Potential to adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and other non-auto mobility in conjunction with planned future development in the region.	Policies M 1.1.1, M 1.2.1 through M 1.2.3, M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5, M 1.4.3, M 4.2.1 through M 4.2.6, LU 1.1.5, LU 2.6.1, LU 2.7.6, LU 4.1.3, LU 4.1.6, and LU 4.2.1. Policy M1.1.1 requires the City to preserve and manage rights-of-way consistent with City standards. Policies M1.2.1 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions and quality of the system and prioritization of emergency service needs when developing transportation plans and network changes. Policies M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.4.3 encourages residential developments to participate in or create Transportation Management Associations to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips. Policies M 4.2.1 through M 4.2.6 promotes pedestrian and bicycle transportation by ensuring that roadway projects designate sufficient travel spaces for all users, Ensuring adequate street tree canopy, addition of pedestrian and bicycle facilities on bridges, designate multi-modal corridors in the Central City, and identifying and filling gaps to make streets more complete. Policy LU 1.1.5 promotes infill development, reuse, and growth, including promoting pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. Policy LU 2.6.1 promotes compact development patterns, mixed use, and higher-development intensities that facilitate walking, bicycling, and transit use. Policy LU 2.7.6 requires new development and reuse and investment projects to create walkable, pedestrian-scaled blocks, publicly accessible mid-block and alley pedestrian routes where appropriate, and sidewalks appropriately scaled for the anticipated pedestrian use. Policy LU 4.1.6 promotes better multi-model connections between residential neighborhoods and community-supportive destinations. Policy LU 4.2.1 requires the City to pursue opportunities to promote walking and</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>Impact 4.12-2: Adverse effects to roadway LOS within the Policy Area associated with planned future development in the region.</p>	<p>biking in existing suburban neighborhoods.</p> <p>Policies M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, and M 1.4.2. Policy M 1.2.2 requires implementation of a flexible Level of Service (LOS) standard. Policies M 1.3.1 through M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>
<p>Impact 4.12-3: Potential adverse effects to roadway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions resulting from planned development under the 2035 General Plan, such that the jurisdictions minimum acceptable level-of-service thresholds are not met.</p>	<p>Policies M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, and M 1.4.2. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-1. Widen 47th Avenue from 4 to 6 lanes. (The feasibility of implementing this mitigation measure is unlikely due to potential policy conflict, right-of-way availability, and potential environmental impact.)</p>	County of Sacramento	Uncertain	County of Sacramento
Impact 4.12-4: Potential impacts to freeway segments.	<p>Policies M 1.2.2, M 1.3.1, M 1.3.2, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.3.6, M 1.4.1, M 1.4.2, M 1.5.6, M 1.5.7, M 4.1.5. Policies M1.2.2 through M1.2.3 require management of the circulation system to ensure safe conditions of the system. Policies M 1.3.1 through 1.3.3 and M 1.3.5 promote efficient travel for all modes by requiring applicable new development to develop a well-connected transportation grid or modified grid network, by eliminating gaps in the network, improving transit access, removing barriers to accessibility, and improving connections to transit stations. Policy M 1.3.6 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and SACOG to identify linkage opportunities for existing and future transportation corridors through jurisdictional boundaries. Policies M 1.4.1 and M 1.4.2 promote</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	increase in vehicle occupancy and reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips. Policy M 1.5.6 supports State highway expansion consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS. Policy 1.5.7 requires the City to work with Caltrans and adjacent jurisdictions to identify funding for improvements that address cumulative effects of planned development on the freeway system. Policy M 4.1.5 requires the City to work with adjacent jurisdictions and other agencies in the context of multimodal corridor planning to determine the appropriate responsibilities to fund, evaluate, plan, design, construct, and maintain new river crossings.			
Impact 4.12-5: Potential construction-related impacts to the local roadway network.	Policies M 1.2.2, M 4.1.1, LU 2.5.1. Policy M 1.2.2 requires implementation of a flexible Level of Service (LOS) standard. Policy M 1.4.1 promotes increase in vehicle occupancy. Policy LU 2.5.1 requires new development to maximize connection and minimize barriers between neighborhoods, corridors, and centers.	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.13 Visual Resources				
Impact 4.13-1: Creation of a new source of light or glare that is substantially greater than typical urban sources and may cause sustained annoyance and/or hazard for	Policies LU 6.1.12, ER 7.1.3, ER 7.1.4. Policy ER 7.1.3 requires that misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary outdoor lighting be minimized. Policy LU 6.1.12, Compatibility with Adjoining Uses, includes a requirement for lighting to be shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
<p>nearby, visually sensitive receptors, such as neighborhood residents.</p>	<p>adjacent residential uses. Policy ER 7.1.4 prohibits new development from (1) using reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface and on the bottom three floors, (2) using mirrored glass, (3) using black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building, (4) using metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building, and (5) using exposed concrete that exceeds 50 percent of any building. These design features would minimize potential impacts related to daytime glare.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.13-2: Interference with an important, existing scenic resource or degrade the view of an important, existing scenic resource, as seen from a visually sensitive, public location.</p>	<p>Policies LU 2.2.1 through 2.2.3, LU 2.3.1, LU 2.3.2, LU 5.6.4, LU 5.6.5, LU 6.1.12, LU 9.1.4, ER 7.1.1, ER 7.1.2, ER 7.1.5. Policies LU 2.2.1 through LU 2.3.3 encourage access to and protection of rivers and waterways by encouraging conservation and restoration and improving access. Policy LU 2.3.2 requires development adjacent to parks and opens spaces to complement and benefit the park and opens space in part by preserving visual access, requiring development to front, using single-loaded streets, providing pedestrian and multi-use trails. Policy LU 5.6.5 protects views of the capitol by requiring conformance with the Capitol View Protection Act. Policy LU 6.1.12 requires compatibility with adjoining uses, including height, setbacks, landscaping, and lighting. Policy LU 9.1.4 requires use of open space to soften edges between urban and natural environments. Policy ER 7.1.1 would guide the</p>	<p>City of Sacramento, Community Development Department</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>City of Sacramento Community Development Department</p>

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	City to avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects of new development on views from public places to the Sacramento and American Rivers and adjacent greenways, landmarks, and the State Capitol along Capitol Mall. This is further complemented by Policy ER 7.1.2, which states that the City shall require new development be located and designed to visually complement the natural environment/setting when near the Sacramento and American Rivers, and along streams.			
4.14 Climate Change				
Impact 4.14-1: Potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	<p>Policies LU 1.1.4, LU 1.1.5, LU 1.1.10, LU 2.2.2, LU 2.3.1, LU 2.4.1, LU 2.5.1, LU 2.5.2, LU 2.6.1, LU 2.6.3 through 2.6.11, LU 2.7.6, LU 2.8.4, LU 2.8.6, LU 4.1.1 through 4.1.4, LU 4.1.6 through 4.1.10, LU 4.2.1, LU 4.2.2, LU 4.3.1, LU 4.3.2, LU 4.4.6, LU 4.5.2, LU 4.5.3, LU 4.5.4, LU 4.5.5, LU 5.1.2, LU 5.1.4, LU 5.1.5, LU 5.4.1, LU 5.4.2, LU 5.4.3, LU 5.5.1, LU 5.6.2, LU 5.6.3, LU 6.1.1 through LU 6.1.6, LU 6.1.8, LU 6.1.9, LU 7.1.2, LU 7.1.4, LU 8.2.2, LU 8.2.6, LU 8.2.7, LU 9.1.3, LU 10.1.3, HCR 2.1.6, HCR 2.1.7, HCR 2.1.10 through HCR 2.1.12, HCR 2.1.14, HCR 2.1.15, HCR 2.1.17, ED 1.1.7, ED 3.1.9, M 1.3.3, M 1.3.5, M 1.4.1 through M 1.4.3, M 1.5.1, M 1.5.2, M 1.5.4, M 1.5.5, M 2.1.1 through M 2.1.5, M 2.1.7, M 2.1.9, M 3.1.1 through M 3.1.5, M 3.1.8 through M 3.1.10, M 3.1.12, M 3.1.13 through M 3.1.20, M 3.2.1 through M 3.2.5, M 3.3.1, M 4.2.1 through M</p>	City of Sacramento, Community Development Department	On-going	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts				
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement
	<p>4.2.6, M 4.3.1, M 4.3.2, M 4.4.2 through M 4.4.4, M 5.1.1 through M 5.1.14, M 6.1.1, M 6.1.2, M 6.1.4, M 6.1.7, M 6.1.8, M 9.1.3, U 1.1.8, U 1.1.9, U 2.1.2, U 2.1.10 through U 2.1.17, U 3.1.2, U 3.1.5, U 4.1.2, U 4.1.5, U 4.1.6, U 5.1.1, U 5.1.2, U 5.1.4, U 5.1.8, U 5.1.10 through U 5.1.17, U 5.1.20 through U 5.1.25, U 6.1.2 through U 6.1.11, U 6.1.13 through U 6.1.17, PHS 4.1.1, PHS 4.1.7, PHS 5.1.7 through PHS 5.1.15, ER 1.1.1, ER 1.1.8, ER 1.1.9, ER 2.1.1 through ER 2.1.9, ER 2.1.14 through ER 2.1.16, ER 3.1.1 through ER 3.1.9, ER 4.1.1, ER 4.2.1 through ER 4.2.3, ER 6.1.1 through ER 6.1.3, ER 6.1.5 through ER 6.1.14, EC 2.1.28.</p> <p>The proposed General Plan contains a comprehensive strategy that achieves a community-wide GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, and sets the City on course towards reducing ongoing GHG emissions reductions in the future through 2035 and 2050. The proposed 2035 General Plan incorporates the GHG reduction strategy of the 2012 CAP, which demonstrates the project's 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 emissions reduction efforts beyond 2020, and progress toward meeting long-term GHG emissions reduction goals. Policy ER 6.1.9 also commits the City to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of new GHG emissions</p>			

2035 General Plan Policies Reducing Environmental Impacts			
Impact	General Plan Policies	Implementing Party	Monitoring and Enforcement
	reduction measures in view of the City's longer-term GHG emission reduction goals.		