

---

---

***Appendix C***

***Initial Study***

---

---



# 65TH STREET STATION AREA STUDY

## [T15068100 (TH16)]

### INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been required and prepared by the City of Sacramento Development Services Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; and the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

#### **Organization of the Initial Study**

This Initial Study contains the following sections:

**Section I – Project Background:** Page 2 - Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, and the date this Initial Study was completed.

**Section II – Project Description:** Page 4 - includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

**Section III – Environmental Checklist and Discussion:** Page 5 - contains the Environmental Checklist form together with a discussion of the checklist questions. The following are significance determinations for the proposed project:

Potentially Significant Impacts - identifies impacts that may have a significant effect on the environment, but for which the level of significance cannot be appropriately determined without further analysis in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

or

Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated - identifies impacts that could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures

or

Less Than Significant Impacts - identifies impacts that would be less than significant and do not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

**Section IV – Potentially Affected Environmental Factors:** Page 55 - identifies which environmental factors were determined to have either a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated,” as indicated in the Environmental Checklist.

**Section V - Determination:** Page 56 - identifies the determination of whether impacts associated with development of the Proposed project are significant, and what, if any, added environmental documentation may be required.

**References Cited:** Page 5757.

## Section I – Project Background

Project Name and File Number: 65TH STREET STATION AREA STUDY  
[T15068100 (TH16)]

Project Location: The project area is generally bordered by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks and California State University, Sacramento (CSUS or Sacramento State) on the north, 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, Power Inn Road to the east, and 59<sup>th</sup> Street to the west.

Project Applicant: City of Sacramento, Department of Transportation

Project Planner: Fedolia “Sparky” Harris  
Department of Transportation  
New City Hall  
915 I Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 808-2996  
fharris@cityofsacramento.org

Environmental Planner: Jennifer Hageman  
Department of Development Services  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
(916) 808-5538  
jhageman@cityofsacramento.org

Date Initial Study Completed: October 2009

## Introduction

The City of Sacramento is the lead agency for preparation of this Initial Study (IS) for the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Project Area project (proposed project). This IS examines the effects of the project on the environment in order to identify the most appropriate type of environmental document which should be prepared for the project. The IS also identifies areas where potentially significant effects could occur and additional analysis is needed.

The analysis contained in this document incorporates, by reference, general discussions and portions of earlier environmental documents prepared for projects in the vicinity of the proposed project (per CEQA Guidelines section 15150(a)). Those documents include:

- *City of Sacramento General Plan Update Technical Background Report*, June 2005.
- *City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*, City of Sacramento, Certified March 3, 2009.
- *South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan*, Draft and Final EIR, July 2004.
- *65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan*, Draft and Final EIR, February 2004.
- *65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Study Existing Conditions Memorandum*, October 2007.
- *65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan*, October 2002.

- *65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Draft EIR*, December 2001.
- *Power Inn Road/Folsom Boulevard Intersection Area Improvements Project (Southeast Area Transportation Study, Phase 1)*, Draft EIR, April 2000.

These documents are available for public review at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Sacramento. The public counter is open from 9:00 am to noon and from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm Monday through Friday. Other documents referred to in this IS are listed in the Reference Section of this document and are also available for public review at the City's Richards Boulevard location.

## **Section II – Project Description**

The 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area project (proposed project) is described in detail in Chapter 3.0, Project Description of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Chapter 3.0 for a description of the project.

Please note that this analysis is prepared on a programmatic level. The analysis examines the environmental impacts of a series of projects that can be characterized as one large project or plan, the proposed 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Plan. With respect to individual projects that would be carried out as part of plan implementation and subsequent to this analysis, section 15168(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that subsequent activities should be examined in light of the Program EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared. It is anticipated that subsequent environmental review would be necessary for construction of each element of the Plan.

## Section III – Environmental Checklist and Discussion

### 1. LAND USE

*Would the proposal:*

- A) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?

### **Environmental Setting**

Portions of the project area are subject to policies and standards contained in several planning documents including the Sacramento 2030 General Plan, the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan, the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Area Plan, and the Redding Avenue Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Project. If the proposed project is approved, it would supersede the transportation improvements adopted as part of the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan. The proposed project would not fundamentally change the concepts, policies or transportation improvements of the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan or the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan. Approved land uses in those two plans would not change.

The proposed project does not propose alterations to land uses or zoning designations and would not alter the present or planned land use of the project area.

Also, residential, retail/commercial, office, and mixed-use land uses previously adopted as part of the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan would not be amended.

The discussion of impacts to the physical environment (i.e., loss of biological resources, changes in hydrology, etc.) resulting from the project are addressed in the subsequent sections of this Initial Study.

### **Answers to Checklist Questions**

#### **Question A: Land Use**

In addition to the City's 2030 General Plan, portions of the project area are governed by other land use planning documents including the Power Inn Road/Folsom Boulevard Intersection Area Improvements Project (Southeast Area Transportation Study, Phase 1), the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan, 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan, and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan. The proposed project would accommodate traffic projected to occur as a result of land uses approved by these planning documents.

Roadway widenings and extensions would require the removal of several buildings including multiple businesses and approximately two residences – two residences would be removed to accommodate the San Joaquin Extension under Scenario B. However, the removal of those buildings would not affect the overall land use plan for the area because the overall land use distribution within the project area would not change. The proposed project (Scenario B or C) would not result in land use redesignations or zoning changes. Although roadways would be extended within the project area to provide connections between neighborhoods and eliminate barriers, the roadway extensions would not alter any of the approved land use plans.

## Findings

The proposed project would not change existing and planned land uses. Therefore, neither scenario would result in alterations to the planned or existing land uses in the project area.

### 2. POPULATION AND HOUSING

*Would the proposal:*

- A) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
- B) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

## Environmental Setting

This area is largely built out and previously adopted land use plans anticipate some intensification and new housing development within the project area. However the roadway extensions proposed under the proposed project (Scenarios B and C) would not contribute to an increase in residential growth in the area because the proposed improvements are considered growth accommodating rather than growth inducing.

The proposed roadway extensions would, however, result in the displacement of several buildings including multiple businesses and two residences – two residences would be removed to accommodate the San Joaquin Extension under Scenario B.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Questions A and B: Housing and Population Impacts

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) would not alter the location, overall distribution, density, or growth rate in the project area. However, approximately two residences would be removed to accommodate the San Joaquin Extension under Scenario B. No affordable housing would be removed as part of the project.

Several adopted plans govern land uses in the project area and the proposed project (Scenarios B and C) would not amend those land uses. The proposed project is designed to respond to growth already planned for in the project area and seeks to connect existing and planned neighborhoods and provide opportunities for alternative transportation modes. In addition, East Sacramento is an existing urbanized area and the proposed project does not introduce new housing or population to the area. The proposed project identifies roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements, including roadway extensions and widenings that respond to development already planned for in the project area. The proposed project would not introduce new vehicle trips to the area. Since the proposed project would not induce new growth, and since the surrounding neighborhoods are largely developed, the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute to new population or housing demand and growth.

## Findings

The proposed project would not result in significant changes to population and housing or directly or indirectly induce new growth not currently included in adopted plans. Although approximately two residences would be removed to accommodate the San Joaquin Extension

under Scenario B, the removal of these two residences would not affect the growth of the area nor displace any affordable housing.

### 3. CLIMATE CHANGE

*Would the proposal:*

A) Emit greenhouse gases in excess of those assumed in the MEIR?

The proposed project includes a review of the circulation networks and mitigation measures contained in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area plan to determine their consistency with pedestrian-friendly transit village criteria, development of a circulation plan for the area, and development of a program of improvements that would be consistent with the City's multi-modal transportation vision for the area. The proposed project does not include approvals or entitlements for any development or construction activities, but roadway network improvements could be made upon Plan approval. The project includes identification and evaluation of various modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle and public transit. While the design and development of a multi-modal system is consistent with the City's goals and policies as set forth in the 2030 General Plan, aspects of the proposed plans could have an adverse effect on specific components of the existing and proposed transportation system. The proposed project would change the trip distribution in the project area by rerouting traffic along improved roadways and roadway extensions, but the proposed project would not increase the number of vehicles along the roadway network. The total traffic volume for the roadway network within the Plan area would not change as a result of the proposed project.

The Master EIR prepared for the 2030 General Plan included a discussion and analysis of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions that could be generated by future development in the city consistent with the land use plan established by the general plan. The discussion of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions contained in the Master EIR is incorporated by reference in this EIR. Implementation of the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Plan (proposed project) was assumed in the Master EIR. The proposed project would not change the land uses assumed for the Plan area addressed in the Master EIR. The Master EIR analysis concluded the cumulative impact of climate change was significant and unavoidable; however, the impact was overridden by the City Council in their certification of the Master EIR.

Development of a multi-modal transportation system would have beneficial effects on the City's effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging the development and use of transportation modes that provide a meaningful alternative to travel by the single occupant vehicle. The design and planning for a multi-modal system of transportation would enhance the City's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as identified in the 2030 General Plan and Master EIR. No further analysis of the issue is required in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>4. SEISMICITY, SOILS, AND GEOLOGY</b>				
<i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				<b>X</b>
A) Seismic hazards?				
B) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions?				<b>X</b>
C) Subsidence of land (groundwater pumping or dewatering)?				<b>X</b>
D) Unique geologic or physical features?				<b>X</b>

## Environmental Setting

*Regional Geology.* The project area is located in the flat surface of the Great Valley geomorphic province of California. The Great Valley is an alluvial plain approximately 50 miles wide and 400 miles long in the central portion of California. The project area is located within the Sacramento Valley. The northern portion of the valley is referred to as the Sacramento Valley and is drained by the Sacramento River.<sup>1</sup>

*Seismic Hazards.* There are no known faults with the city of Sacramento or the Sacramento region. The nearest faults to the city are the Bear Mountain and New Melones faults to the east, and the Midland Fault to the west. In addition, the Dunnigan Hills Fault, a potential fault, lies to the northwest of the city.<sup>2</sup> No unique geological features have been identified in the project area.

Although all of California is typically regarded as seismically active, the Central Valley region does not commonly experience strong ground shaking resulting from earthquakes along known and previously unknown active faults. As a result, the ground shaking hazard within the city is low. In addition, there are no known faults located within the city and the risk of fault rupture is considered low.<sup>3</sup>

The project area is not located within an area of poorly consolidated to unconsolidated soils that could result in seismic hazards such as liquefaction.<sup>4</sup>

*Soils.* The predominant soils within the project area consist of San Joaquin soils, which are characterized as typically well and moderately well drained, with medium to very high run-off, and very slow permeability.<sup>5</sup>

1 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-1.

2 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-1.

3 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-6.

4 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-6.

5 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-7.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project introduces either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A: Seismic Hazards

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) include street extensions and widenings, intersection realignments, and grade separated undercrossings. While the project area is located in an area with a low ground shaking and liquefaction risk, the proposed project could increase or exacerbate the risk to life and human property for persons using these improvements, especially the under crossings. However, all infrastructure associated with the proposed project would be constructed in compliance with the most current state and local construction standards; therefore, the potential for seismic damage to these structures would be minimal. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Question B: Erosion and Unstable Soil Conditions

The project area is flat so erosion hazards do not present substantial hazards. However, soils within the project area may be subject to erosion if exposed during construction activities or grading. The Sacramento City Code (Ordinance 15.88.250) requires that all grading and erosion control shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the City Code to prevent erosion of soils during construction. In addition, adherence to best management practices during construction would also reduce the potential for erosion to occur. Erosion during operation of the proposed project is not expected to occur due to the built-up nature of the surrounding area and the type of project improvements. Therefore, erosion impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Question C: Subsidence

In the Sacramento area, the three most common causes of subsidence are groundwater withdrawal, oil and natural gas withdrawal, and the oxidation of peat in the Delta.<sup>6,7</sup> The proposed project (Scenarios B and C) would tunnel under the UPRR tracks; however, the excavation would be expected to be approximately 20 feet deep and dewatering is not expected to occur.

The Sacramento 2030 General Plan Master EIR addressed subsidence within the Policy Area, including the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area project area.<sup>8</sup> The Master EIR stated that as part of the construction permitting process, the City requires completed reports of soil conditions at the specific construction sites to identify potentially unsuitable soil conditions including liquefaction, settlement, subsidence, lateral spreading, and collapse. The City requires that these evaluations be conducted by registered soil professionals, and measures to eliminate inappropriate soil conditions must be applied, depending on the soil conditions. The design of foundation and excavation-wall support must conform to the analysis and implementation

---

6 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.1-11.

7 City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Draft EIR, December 2001, Appendix C – Initial Study, p. 19.

8 City of Sacramento, Sacramento 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, adopted March 3, 2009, p. 6.5-22.

criteria described in the CBC, Chapters 16, 18, 33, and the appendix to Chapter 33. Adherence to the CBC and City policies contained in the 2030 General Plan would ensure the maximum practicable protection available for users of buildings and infrastructure and their associated trenches, slopes, and foundations.<sup>9</sup>

Although subsidence is not considered a hazard for the proposed UPRR undercrossing, all infrastructure associated with the proposed project would be constructed in compliance with the most current state and local construction standards, therefore, impacts would be ***less than significant***.

#### **Question D: Other Geological or Topographic Features**

No unique geological features have been identified in the project area. Impacts would be ***less than significant***.

#### **Findings**

Due to the proposed project's location in an area with a low ground shaking and liquefaction risk, impacts resulting from seismic ground shaking would not be expected to occur. The type of circulation improvements proposed would not increase the possible risks from seismic activity. Erosion control during construction would be subject to the guidelines set forth in the City Code and implementation of best management practices. Due to the low probability for subsidence to occur due to dewatering in the project area, the risk of structural damage due to subsidence in the area is considered minimal. There are no unique geological or topographical features in the project area that would be adversely affected by the proposed project. Therefore, impacts resulting from seismic, soils, or geologic conditions would be ***less than significant***.

---

9 City of Sacramento, Sacramento 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, adopted March 3, 2009, p. 6.5-22.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>5. WATER</b> <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				
A) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface/stormwater runoff (e.g. during or after construction; or from material storage areas, vehicle fueling/maintenance areas, waste handling, hazardous materials handling & storage, delivery areas, etc.)?			X	
B) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?			X	
C) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality that substantially impact temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity, beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits, or cause harm to the biological integrity of the waters?			X	
D) Changes in flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff that cause environmental harm or significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?			X	
E) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?			X	
F) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawal, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?			X	
G) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?			X	
H) Impacts to groundwater quality?			X	

## Environmental Setting

*Surface Water/Groundwater.* The project area is located less than ¼ mile from the American River, one of the largest sources of surface water in the city of Sacramento. The American

River watershed encompasses approximately 1,900 square miles and is a tributary of the Sacramento River.<sup>10</sup> The city is located within the North and South American groundwater subbasins, within the larger Central Valley groundwater basin. In general, groundwater levels in the vicinity of the city are reported to be stable, between 20 feet above and 40 feet below sea level, and have fluctuated less than ten feet since the 1970s.

Recharge to the local aquifer system occurs along active river and stream channels where extensive sand and gravel deposits exist, particularly the American and Sacramento river channels. Other sources of recharge within the city include inflow of groundwater generally from the northeast; subsurface recharge from fractured geologic formations to the east; and deep percolation from applied surface water and precipitation on open space areas and small streams.<sup>11</sup>

*Water Quality.* Ambient water quality in the Sacramento and American rivers is influenced by numerous natural and artificial sources, including soil erosion, discharges from industrial and residential wastewater plants, stormwater runoff, agriculture, recreation activities, mining, timber harvesting, and flora and fauna. The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in urban stormwater runoff. The general permit requires the permittee to employ “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) before, during, and after construction. The primary objective of the BMPs is to reduce non-point source pollution into waterways. These practices include BMPs for construction sites. BMP mechanisms minimize erosion and sedimentation, and prevent pollutants such as oil and grease from entering the stormwater drains. BMPs are approved by City of Sacramento Department of Utilities before projects begin construction (the BMP document is available from the Department of Utilities, Flood Control and Sewers Division, 1391 35th Avenue, Sacramento, CA). Components of BMPs include:

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

*Flooding.* The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) that delineate flood hazard zones for communities. The entire project area is designated as Zone X, which are areas defined as “areas protected from the 100 year flood by levee, dike, or other structures subject to possible failure or overtopping during larger floods.”<sup>12</sup> The railroad embankment serves as a redundant levee for flood protection in the area.

---

10 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 6.2-5.

11 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, pp. 6.2-8 and 6.2-9.

12 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 7.2-8.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project substantially degrades water quality and violates any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by consumption and/or operational activities; or
- The project substantially increases exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A: Drainage and Runoff

Future construction of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) would involve soil-disturbing construction activities, such as grading and excavation. As mentioned previously, future development projects and associated construction activities would be addressed in more detail in subsequent environmental review. However, for the purposes of this project it is anticipated that during construction of the project elements, soils that are currently covered by vegetation or impervious surfaces (i.e., parking lots) would be exposed to wind or rain, depending on the time of year that construction would occur. Runoff from construction could increase over existing conditions due to the increased soil exposure. Runoff during construction would be limited by complying with City Code (Ordinance 15.88.250) which requires the contractor to show erosion and sediment control methods, including methods to control urban runoff pollution, on the improvement plans. Also, as a matter of standard practice, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared prior to construction of any project element and implemented throughout construction activities.

In addition, operation of the proposed project would introduce additional impervious surfaces to the area by providing new roadway segments, widened roadways, sidewalks, and vehicular and/or bicycle under crossings. Under Scenario B or C, approximately three linear miles of new roadway would be added to the project area. As a result of the increase in impervious surfaces there would be an increase in runoff, but it is anticipated that runoff patterns and volumes would remain substantially unchanged. All new roadway extensions or connections would be designed to city standards and include stormwater drainage features built into the street section including curbs, gutters, and stormwater facilities.

As discussed in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan EIR and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR, the project area is within a drainage area served by City Sump 31 and City Sump 113. Sump 113 discharges stormwater from the Folsom Boulevard underpass (under the UPRR tracks) to a drainage pipeline that leads to Sump 31.<sup>13</sup> Sump 31 conveys stormwater runoff from the project area, surrounding areas, and Sacramento State to the American River via a channel along Carlson Avenue. There is also an existing stormwater detention basin adjacent to the UPRR tracks near the proposed Broadway Avenue extension (Scenario C).

Sump 31 and its trunk pipeline have adequate capacity for both existing and future conditions.<sup>14</sup> Sump 113 has adequate capacity for existing conditions, but lacks reliability, including, most importantly, a backup pumping unit.<sup>15</sup> Changes in the amount of impervious surface near Sump 113 could introduce more runoff into Sump 113 and could adversely affect the sump's ability to

---

13 City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Draft EIR, December 2001, p. 6.7-5.

14 Martin Farber, City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, written communication, August 17, 2009.

15 Martin Farber, City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, written communication, August 17, 2009.

operate correctly.<sup>16</sup> Specifically, the realignment of 69th Street to connect Elvas Avenue directly with Redding Avenue with the addition of a signalized intersection at Folsom Boulevard (Scenario B) would add additional impervious surfaces and would directly contribute to additional runoff to Sump 113.<sup>17</sup> Increased runoff to Sump 113 could result in inadequate stormwater drainage capacity.

The majority of the project area is built out and the addition of new impervious surfaces would be served by new storm drainage facilities. It is anticipated that the addition of new impervious surfaces to the area would not substantially disrupt existing groundwater recharge because recharge to the local aquifer system primarily occurs along active river and stream channels where extensive sand and gravel deposits exist. The new stormwater facilities would be constructed as part of the roadway extensions and widenings would convey the runoff from the new impervious surfaces to stormwater facilities. Mitigation proposed in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/ University Transit Village Plan EIR (Mitigation Measure 6.7-2) and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR (Mitigation Measure 5.6-1) would not apply because the mitigation is based on the development of specific land uses (i.e., residential, commercial). It is anticipated that the increase in impervious surface area, and therefore runoff, would be served by existing and new stormwater facilities. Runoff patterns would be substantially unchanged and water quality impacts would be minimized during construction through compliance with City Code and the SWPPP. However, the realignment of 69th Street to connect Elvas Avenue directly with Redding Avenue with the addition of a signalized intersection at Folsom Boulevard (Scenario B) would add additional runoff to Sump 113 and could result in a **potentially significant impact**.

### Mitigation Measures

Improvements to Sump 113 would be necessary to ensure stormwater runoff in the project area is properly handled, preventing areas within the project area from localized flooding. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-1 would ensure that appropriate upgrades to Sump 113 occur. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce runoff impacts to a **less-than-significant level**.

MM-1 *Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the realignment of 69<sup>th</sup> Street to connect Elvas Avenue directly with Redding Avenue with the addition of a signalized intersection at Folsom Boulevard (Scenario B), the developer shall demonstrate to the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities that the runoff generated by the roadway improvement would not exceed the capacity of Sump 113. Improvements to ensure that Sump 113 is adequate could include, but would not be limited to, relocation of Sump 113, construction of Sump 113 that is larger than the existing one, improved wetwell hydraulics, added elbow room for maintenance, improved trash handling, backup pumping capacity, and possibly other "reliability" improvements. The City of Sacramento Department of Utilities would be required to approve of any improvements made to Sump 113.*

### Question B: Flooding

According to the FEMA FIRM covering the project area, the project area is designated as Zone X. No new housing is proposed as part of the project. Based on the Zone X designation, the project area is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm event. However, as mentioned above, the railroad embankment serves as a redundant levee. The extension of a roadway through the railroad embankment/redundant levee could compromise the structural

16 Martin Farber, City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, written communication, August 17, 2009.

17 Martin Farber, City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, written communication, August 17, 2009.

integrity of the levee. Three roadway extensions through the railroad embankment are possible: 1) the extension of 65<sup>th</sup> Street to CSUS (Scenario B), 2) Broadway to Ramona Avenue (Scenario B), or 3) San Joaquin Street to Ramona Avenue (Scenario C). Because the extension of these roadways could compromise the levee redundancy for the area, the impact is *potentially significant*.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Flood control mechanisms would be necessary to ensure that the project area and surrounding areas are protected from a flood event. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-2 would ensure that flood protection remains in place.

- MM-2 a) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the new railroad undercrossing, the City of Sacramento Department of Transportation shall prepare a construction flood management plan which details a triggered response should the American River reach the warning stage elevation at American River at the H Street Bridge (40 feet) during construction. As part of the plan, the City shall describe what measures would be taken during construction such that flood protection remains in place. Temporary measures may include, but would not be limited to, construction of a temporary embankment consisting of rock, soil, and plastic sheeting at the undercrossing site. The City of Sacramento Department of Utilities shall approve the construction flood management plan prior to construction.*
- b) *As part of the improvements to the levee for the new railroad undercrossing, the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (DOU) shall ensure that the project area would continue to have the minimum flood protection required by City regulations. The DOU shall require the project to include permanent improvements to ensure that flood protection is achieved which shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the installation of flood gates on the railroad undercrossing.*

### **Questions C through E: Discharges or Alterations of Surface Water Quality**

Construction related activities associated with the proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) have the potential to impact water quality. Fuel, oil, grease, solvents, concrete wash and other chemicals used in construction activities have the potential of creating toxic problems if allowed to enter a waterway. The degree of construction related impacts to water quality is partially determined by the duration of various construction activities, timing of construction, and rainfall distribution. The project is required to comply with the City's Code Ordinance 15.88.250, Erosion and Sediment Control, which requires that an erosion and sediment control plan be prepared for all projects to control surface runoff and erosion. In addition, projects must retain sediment on or within the area of disturbance and prevent pollution of site runoff during the period beginning when any preconstruction- or construction-related grading or soil storage first occurs, until all final improvements and permanent structures are complete. The City shall also require BMPs be employed before, during, and after construction. Compliance with BMP provisions would assure that development and use of the site would result in a less-than-significant impact to surface waters and would not result in the alteration of surface water quality. Furthermore, as stated in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction, the Contractor is responsible for controlling erosion and sedimentation within the limits of the project site at all times during the course of construction. The Contractor shall implement measures to prevent sediment and construction debris from entering City of Sacramento storm drain systems and shall provide protection around any drain inlets that receive runoff from the

limits of the construction zone. For these reasons, construction impacts to water quality would be *less than significant*.

Operational activities could also affect water quality. Stormwater runoff could carry oil, grease, gasoline, and other contaminants from roadways into local waterways. This stormwater runoff is not expected to alter surface water quality or currents of local waterways because the proposed project would be required to upgrade and install necessary storm drain infrastructure to ensure that there would be no adverse impact to surface waters. The project would also be required to adhere to City regulations regarding stormwater runoff volumes and quality.

Existing and new stormwater facilities (i.e., curbs, gutters) included as part of the proposed project would collect and direct stormwater from the roadways to drainage facilities to prevent it from draining to nearby wetlands near the Ramona Avenue extension (Scenarios B and C). If the wetlands near the Ramona Avenue extension are not under the Corps jurisdiction, the project applicant would be required to obtain a report of waste discharge from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). A report of waste discharge from the SWRCB would further determine potential environmental impacts on the wetlands.

Although stormwater facilities would be in place, some contaminants could still enter the stormwater system.

Therefore, operation of the project would result in a ***potentially significant impact***.

### **Mitigation Measures**

As discussed in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan EIR, the contribution of urban contaminants could affect water quality. The 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-7 discusses developing a water quality mitigation plan for each component of the project, and implementing source control measures and on-site treatment controls. Implementation of similar mitigation throughout the project area to limit the introduction of contaminants into local waterways, either during construction or operation of the project would reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level***.

*MM-3 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Sacramento Department of Transportation shall prepare a water quality mitigation plan for each project component to be reviewed and approved by the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities. This plan shall provide details regarding construction and operational Best Management Practices (BMPs), in compliance with the City's NPDES permit, which reduce urban contaminants in stormwater runoff.*

### **Questions F through H: Groundwater**

The project area is largely built out with impervious surfaces dominating the area. There are few opportunities in the project area for groundwater recharge. Groundwater recharge typically occurs near streams and rivers. However, the project area does support one large undeveloped area of wetlands near the Ramona Avenue extension (Scenarios B and C). If the wetlands near the Ramona Avenue extension are not under the Corps jurisdiction, the project applicant would be required to obtain a report of waste discharge from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), as discussed above. This wetland area provides a groundwater recharge opportunity. Construction and operation of the proposed project could introduce additional contaminants to the area. However, the Sacramento 2030 General Plan MEIR concluded that although earth-disturbing activities associated with construction in the Policy Area would be

temporary, on- or off-site soil erosion, siltation, discharges of construction-related hazardous materials could degrade downstream surface waters or groundwater. Compliance with NPDES requirements, implementation of a Spill Prevention and Control Program (SPCP), compliance with the City's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance and Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Code, and compliance with General Plan policies would reduce the potential for groundwater contamination to a less-than-significant level.<sup>18</sup> In addition, the MEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would not adversely affect groundwater levels as the City relies on surface water for its potable water supply.<sup>19</sup> As the proposed project was assumed in the MEIR, impacts related to the development of the proposed project would also be ***less than significant***.

## Findings

Operation of the proposed project would introduce additional impervious surfaces to the area, potentially increasing the amount of runoff in the area. Although the proposed project would change existing drainage patterns through development of new roadway connections, sidewalks, and bike paths, Mitigation Measure MM-1 would be require the developer to upgrade and install necessary storm drain infrastructure to handle additional runoff generated by the project.

Temporary construction impacts related to the installation of roadway extensions, roadway widenings, or other ground disturbing activities would be controlled through existing regulations. However, operation of the project could generate additional pollutants in the project area that could affect surface water. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-3 would reduce impacts on surface water to a ***less-than-significant level***. As such, no significant impacts to surface water or groundwater are anticipated to result from project construction or operation. No additional environmental analysis is required.

---

18 City of Sacramento, Sacramento 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report, March 3, 2009, pp. 6.7-24 through 6.7-29.

19 City of Sacramento, Sacramento 2030 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report, March 3, 2009, p. 6.11-32.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>6. AIR QUALITY</b> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
A) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		<b>X</b>		
B) Exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants?		<b>X</b>		
C) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				<b>X</b>
D) Create objectionable odors?				<b>X</b>

### Environmental Setting

The project area is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is subject to federal, state, and local air quality regulations. Only the southern portion of the SVAB (Sacramento County) is in non-attainment for federal ozone standards. Regarding state standards, the entire SVAB is in non-attainment for ozone, and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>).<sup>20</sup> Air quality management in Sacramento is the responsibility of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws for Sacramento County.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- **Ozone:** The project increases nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) levels above 85 pounds per day for short-term effects (construction). The project increases either ozone precursors, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) or reactive organic gases (ROG), above 65 pounds per day for long-term effects (operation).
- **Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>):** The project emits pollutants at a level equal to, or greater than, five percent of the CAAQS (50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) if there is an existing or projected violation; however, if a project is below the ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> thresholds, it is assumed that the project is below the PM<sub>10</sub> threshold as well.
- **Carbon Monoxide (CO):** The project results in CO concentrations that exceeds the 1-hour State ambient air quality standard of 20.0 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour State ambient standard of 9.0 ppm.
- **Toxic Air Contaminants:** The project would create a significant impact if it creates a risk of 10 in 1 million for cancer.

20 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, p. 6.5-3.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A and B: Air Quality Standards and Sensitive Receptors

The SMAQMD identifies two phases of construction related emissions. Phase I emissions include emissions related to site preparation (i.e., grading). The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) include some level of grading and earth moving to prepare the ground for roadway extensions, railroad under crossings, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The extent, intensity, and location of these improvements could exceed adopted air quality emissions standards and expose nearby sensitive receptors to increased pollutant emissions. Therefore, air emissions resulting from project construction is considered ***potentially significant*** and will be evaluated in the EIR.

Phase II emissions include long term operational air quality effects related to traffic generated air quality effects. The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) may result in changes in levels of service and traffic volumes, which may in turn affect air quality. During peak traffic hours, congestion and vehicle stacking may result in increased CO levels. Nearby sensitive receptors could be exposed to higher levels of air pollutants as a result of operation of Scenarios B or C. As such, the impact is ***potentially significant*** and will be evaluated in the EIR.

### Question C: Micro Climate

Implementation of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) are not expected to result in the alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate, resulting in a ***less-than-significant impact***.

### Question D: Odors

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) would not create permanent objectionable odors. Construction equipment and materials could emit odors perceptible to residents within the project vicinity. However, any construction-related odors would be localized to the immediate vicinity of construction operations and would be temporary, occurring only during active construction. Impacts would be ***less than significant***.

## Findings

Earthwork necessary for the implementation of the proposed project improvements (Scenario B or C) could result in construction-related air quality impacts. Construction and operational emissions that could affect sensitive receptors within the project area will be further examined in the EIR. The preliminary transportation and circulation analysis included in this IS indicates the need for the development of a Traffic Impact Analysis/Study for the proposed project (Scenarios B, and C). Based on refined trip generation and timing of trips, an updated air quality analysis will be prepared which identifies any potential operational impacts and develops appropriate mitigation measures, if necessary, for such impacts. Potential air quality impacts will be analyzed as part of the EIR.

Potential impacts associated with micro climate and odors are less than significant. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>7. <u>TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</u></b> <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
A) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?		X		
B) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
C) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		X		
D) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?				X
E) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?		X		
F) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		X		
G) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?		X		

## Environmental Setting

Roadways in the project area serve vehicles, busses, light rail trains, pedestrians, and bicycles, all to varying degrees. Roadways are often at capacity with vehicles and several bus lines that serve the 65<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station. Many sidewalks are incomplete and do not connect residential neighborhoods to destinations such as the light rail station or the commercial and retail areas near the Folsom Boulevard/65<sup>th</sup> Street intersection. Bicycle access consists of on-street bike lanes, or in some cases, no bike lanes. The proposed project would not change the backbone of the existing roadway network, but would provide additional connections between neighborhoods and provide more opportunities for multi-modal use.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- *Roadways*: the project causes the facility to degrade from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse. For facilities that are already worse than LOS C without the project, a significant impact occurs if the project increases the V/C ratio by 0.02 or more on a roadway.
- *Signalized and unsignalized Intersections*: the project causes the LOS of the intersections to degrade from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse.

For intersections that are already operating at LOS D, E, or F without the project, a significant impact occurs if the project increases the average delay by 5 seconds or more at an intersection.

- *Transit Facilities:* the project-generated ridership, when added to the existing or future ridership, exceeds existing and/or planned system capacity. Capacity is defined as the total number of passengers the system of buses and light rail vehicles can carry during the peak hours of operation. A significant impact occurs if the project adversely affects the transit system operations or facilities in a way that discourages ridership (e.g. removes shelter, reduces park and ride).
- *Bicycle Facilities:* the project eliminates or adversely affects an existing bikeway facility in a way that discourages bikeway use; interferes with the implementation of a proposed bikeway; or results in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts.
- *Pedestrian Facilities:* the project adversely affects an existing pedestrian facility or results in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe pedestrian/bicycle or pedestrian/motor vehicle conflicts.
- *Parking Facilities:* the anticipated parking demands of the project exceed the available or planned parking supply for typical day conditions. However, the impact would not be significant if the Project is consistent with the parking requirements stipulated in the City Code.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A: Vehicle Trips and Congestion

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) include street extensions, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. The proposed project would provide additional neighborhood connections and opportunities for multi-modal travel within the project area. The extension of roadways, vehicular lane reductions, and signalization of intersections as proposed under Scenarios B and C could result in increased travel time along major roadways, increased intersection queuing, or increased delay at intersections. Intersection and/or roadway segments levels of service (LOS) could decrease as a result of the proposed transportation improvements. Also, vehicles within the project area could use alternate routes to avoid such delays, possibly resulting in different travel patterns. Therefore, the impact is ***potentially significant***. Potential impacts to intersections and roadways, including changes in level of service, volume to capacity ratio, and intersection delay, will be assessed in the EIR.

### Questions B and C: Hazards and Access

*Long-term Operational Impacts.* The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) are expected to substantially change the configuration of existing streets and roadways. Some roadways, including Broadway (Scenarios B and C) and Ramona Avenue (Scenarios B and C) would connect neighborhoods that are currently separated by physical barriers such as the UPRR tracks and the levee. Emergency vehicle access in the project area could be enhanced by these roadway extensions by providing more direct routes to existing neighborhoods. Roadway extensions, including railroad under crossings, would be designed to City standards and would not create a design hazard. Because the proposed transportation improvements would not inhibit or reduce emergency vehicle access within the project area and

would not create a design hazard, the long term operational impact to access within and around the project site would be **less than significant**. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.

*Short-term Construction Impacts.* During construction, it is anticipated that the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) could require the temporary rerouting of traffic or narrowing of some traffic lanes along project roadways. In addition, minor temporary traffic hazards may be present during project construction due to transport of equipment and materials. Access to nearby residential areas during construction could also be restricted. These would be short-term impacts only expected to occur during the construction of the proposed transportation improvements. Although construction activities would be temporary, traffic could be adversely affected in the project area during construction. Therefore, temporary impacts to access within and around the project site are **potentially significant** and will be assessed as part of the EIR.

#### **Question D: Parking**

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) would add on-street parallel parking (both sides of street) on several roadways within the project area, which would result in a potential beneficial effect. Implementation of the proposed project (Scenarios B and C) would not directly increase parking demand in the project area, because the project does not propose changes in land uses. Because Scenarios B or C would not increase demand for new parking spaces, there could not be an insufficient parking capacity created. However, the addition of on-street parking in Scenarios B and C is to respond to the overall land plan for the project area, which focuses mainly on transit-oriented and mixed-use development. Since neither Scenario B nor C increases demand for or reduces the capacity of parking spaces in the project area, the impact is **less than significant**. Parking will not be addressed in the EIR.

#### **Question E: Adopted Transportation Plans**

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) could conflict with the City/County Bikeway Master Plan and the Circulation Element of the 2030 General Plan. Therefore, the impact is **potentially significant**. The proposed project's consistency with adopted transportation plans will be assessed as part of the EIR.

#### **Question F: Alternative Transportation**

Implementation of the proposed project (Scenarios B and C) would increase and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Bicycle and pedestrian access to light rail stations in the project area would be enhanced and expanded. The vision for the project area as set forth in the 2030 General Plan is to have a multi-modal transportation system that supports mixed-use, transit-oriented development. Implementation of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) could result in superseding planned roadway improvements contained in the adopted 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan or the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan. However, the proposed project would not interfere with the land use plans adopted as part of those two Plans. As a result of new roadway circulation in the project area, the proposed project could conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, resulting in a **potentially significant impact**. Potential impacts to alternative transportation systems will be analyzed as part of the EIR.

#### **Question G: Rail, Waterborne or Air Traffic**

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) include street extensions, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. These improvements would

not affect water traffic because the project site is not located adjacent to a water body. In addition, the proposed project would not affect air traffic because the proposed project under all scenarios would not construct structures that would encroach on airspace or interfere with existing or future air traffic. Construction of grade separated under crossings would not interfere with UPRR operations as all construction would occur under the rail line and would not place construction equipment on the rail line or otherwise obstruct the rail line. In addition, the proposed Ramona Avenue extension near the existing light rail tracks would not interfere with the existing light rail right-of-way. However, implementation of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenario B and C) could result in intersection queue lengths within the project area that could back up onto the existing at-grade light rail crossings at 59<sup>th</sup> Street and 65<sup>th</sup> Street. As a result, there could be potential conflicts between vehicular queues and operating light rail trains. Therefore, the impact is ***potentially significant***. Potential impacts to rail traffic will be analyzed as part of the EIR.

## **Findings**

The proposed project could have significant impacts on the local and regional circulation system and as such, an updated Traffic Impact Analysis/Study will be completed as part of the environmental review for this project. This study will address roadway and intersection levels of service, roadway volumes, intersection queues, traffic distribution through the project area, roadway design, potential impacts to rail and transit service, and potential impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists. The study will also evaluate the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) against adopted plans and policies applicable to the project. The study will not, however, discuss impacts to air or waterborne traffic as there would not be an impact to air or waterborne traffic, as discussed above.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>8. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u></b>				
<i>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</i>				
A) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)?			<b>X</b>	
B) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage or City street trees)?			<b>X</b>	
C) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?			<b>X</b>	

## Environmental Setting

Biological resources within much of the project area have been previously surveyed for earlier projects, including the Power Inn Road/Folsom Boulevard Intersection Area Improvements Project (Southeast Area Transportation Study, Phase 1), the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan, and the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan. To supplement that earlier work, and confirm that conditions have not changed, PBS&J conducted a reconnaissance-level survey on March 20 and 26, 2009 of the project area (see Appendix A of this Initial Study).

The project area is situated in an urban setting developed with buildings, roadways, and impervious surface area that is generally considered to have low habitat value. Although some parcels are vacant and underutilized, these areas often have been substantially disturbed and have been used for illegal dumping and surface parking, are frequently traversed by pedestrians, are constantly exposed to urban noise, and are surrounded on all sides by urban development.

However, some of these undeveloped areas contain mature trees that may qualify as heritage trees, under the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance, and several drainage ditches which may represent potential waters of the United States, as well as landscaped areas, areas of disturbed nonnative annual grassland, detention basins<sup>21</sup> and a small pond in an abandoned golf course. Additionally, wetlands are located along the UPRR tracks, with a large wetland located east of the tracks, just south of US 50.

According to previous environmental analyses conducted for the Power Inn Road/Folsom Boulevard Intersection Area Improvements Project (Southeast Area Transportation Study, Phase 1), the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan, the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan, and the reconnaissance level surveys conducted in March 2009, special-status plant species, invertebrates, birds, and mammals have the potential to occur within the project area. Special-status plants including rose-mallow (*Hibiscus lasiocarpus*) and Sandford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria*

21 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 20, 2004, p. 4.5-9.

*sanfordii*) have the potential to occur in the roadside drainages in the project area.<sup>22</sup> However, during the site reconnaissance Sanford's arrowhead was not observed in the project area nor in a previously recorded location indicated on the CNDDDB database.<sup>23</sup> Wetlands in the project area have the potential to support special-status vernal pool crustaceans, including vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), a federally listed species. Special-status bird species such as the white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), purple martin (*Progne subis*) and other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) could nest and forage in the project area, although the habitat is considered low quality. No burrowing owls were observed in the project area; however, the nesting season for this species does not start until April.<sup>24</sup> A purple martin colony that has been active for the past six years is located within the Redding Avenue overpass. No purple martins were observed during the site visits; however, the nesting season for this species does not start until mid-April.<sup>25</sup> Special-status bats, such as Townsend's big-eared bat (*Plecotus townsendii*), small-footed myotis bat (*Myotis ciliolabrum*), long-legged myotis bat (*Myotis volans*), and Yuma myotis bat (*Myotis yumanensis*) could roost in the warehouse buildings in the project area and under bridges or roadway over crossings.<sup>26</sup> Bats were not identified during the site reconnaissance.

Additionally, the project area may support heritage trees.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project creates a potential health hazard, or involves the use, production or disposal of materials that pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the affected area;
- The project results in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal;
- The project affects other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands); or
- The project violates the Heritage Tree Ordinance (City Code 12.64.040).

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A: Impacts to Special-Status Species and/or Habitat

Proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) include street extensions, sidewalks and bike lanes/trails, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. In particular, street extensions and bicycle and pedestrian trails through vacant land associated with Scenarios B and C could result in the loss or temporary disturbance of special-status species. Federally-listed invertebrates, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), have been recorded in the seasonal wetland located along the area of the proposed

---

22 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 20, 2004, p. 4.5-2; City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, pp. 5.4-9 and 5.4-10.

23 PBS&J, 65th Street Station Area Biological Resources Survey, March 26, 2009.

24 PBS&J, 65th Street Station Area Biological Resources Survey, March 26, 2009.

25 PBS&J, 65th Street Station Area Biological Resources Survey, March 26, 2009.

26 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 20, 2004, pp. 4.5-3 and 4.5-4; City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, pp. 5.4-10 and 5.4-11.

Ramona Avenue extension. This wetland and others located in the project area could also provide habitat for special-status plant species.

Additionally, the Broadway Street extension, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Extension, and Elvas Avenue/Q Street/Redding Avenue Extension under Scenarios B and C, and the pedestrian tunnel under the UPRR tracks under Scenario C would require removal of buildings that could provide habitat for special-status bat species. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-4 through MM-6 would ensure that potential impacts to special-status species are minimized. Mitigation Measure MM-4 would require plant surveys prior to any construction activities, and either avoidance measures or the development of additional measures in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to offset impacts. Mitigation Measure MM-5 would require either surveys for vernal pool crustaceans, or the assumption of presence in suitable habitat; and avoidance and conservation measures to reduce or offset impacts on these species. Mitigation Measure MM-6 would require preconstruction surveys for special-status bat species in buildings, and exclusion techniques so that the bats would not be present prior to demolition. Impacts to special-status species and their habitat would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

In addition, previous environmental analyses including the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Plan Area EIR also concluded that the project area provides potential nesting and marginal foraging habitat for special-status wildlife species such as the white-tailed kite, Swainson's hawk, western burrowing owl, and purple martin. Purple martins, a species of special concern nest in weep holes on the underside of the freeway and have been recently documented under US 50 in the project area. As described above, a purple martin colony that has been active for the past six years is located within the Redding Avenue overpass. No purple martins were observed during the site visits; however, the nesting season for this species does not start until mid-April and the site reconnaissance occurred in March 2009. The extension of Redding Avenue north to Q Street under Scenarios B and C could impact purple martin nests.

Trees within the project area may also provide marginal nesting habitat for migratory birds, which are protected under the MBTA. Project construction activities could result in the direct removal of migratory bird nests, the locations of which have not yet been determined. Additionally, construction activities could result in the reduced success of nesting birds, such as Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, burrowing owls and purple martins. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-7 would ensure that potential impacts to migratory birds are minimized, through the identification and avoidance of any nests. Impacts to special-status species and their habitat would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

The first Biological Resources' standard of significance speaks to the project's potential to create a health hazard, or the project's use, production or disposal of materials that could pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the affected area. The project area currently provides low quality habitat, due to its developed nature, and the species using the site are acclimated to disturbed habitats; most species using the project area are not sensitive to changes in their environment. Additionally, as described in Section 10, Hazards, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on the accidental explosion, or release of hazardous substances because there are regulations in place that requires these substances to be transported and handled in safe ways. Finally, Section 10, Hazards also discusses the proposed project's potential to result in a health hazard or potential hazard, or the exposure of people to an existing source of potential health hazards. It is determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-9, which requires specific steps be taken if previously unknown contaminated soils are encountered during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-10 would also

reduce the proposed project's potential impact due to the release of hazardous materials on plants and animals to a less-than-significant level, by requiring the proper disposal of any hazardous materials found during construction. Impacts on plants and animals would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

#### **Question B: Impacts to Local Resources such as Trees**

Implementation of proposed traffic improvements (Scenarios B and C) within the project area could impact heritage and/or city street trees, which are protected under City Code sections 12.56 and 12.64. Trees are located throughout the project area along existing commercial and residential development. A tree survey has not been conducted for the proposed project so the location and number of heritage and/or city street trees has not been determined. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-8 would ensure that potential impacts to heritage and/or city street trees are minimized by first requiring a survey to determine the heritage and/or city street trees in the area, avoidance of trees where feasible, and then requiring compliance with the City's tree ordinance. Impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

#### **Question C: Impacts to Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.**

According to previous studies completed in the project area and the reconnaissance-level site visit, seasonal wetland and freshwater marsh habitats are located south of US 50 and east of the UPRR tracks, and in roadside drainages throughout the project area. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) under the authority of the Clean Water Act (CWA) has been tasked with issuing permits for fill activities in wetlands. However, recent court rulings have limited the Corps' jurisdiction over wetlands. The state's jurisdiction extends to all surface and sub-surface waters in the state and these features are protected under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The wetland delineation, required under Mitigation Measure MM-9(a) below, would determine if the wetlands in the project area are under the Corps jurisdiction. If the wetlands are under the Corps jurisdiction, a CWA section 404 permit and section 401 water quality certification would be required. If the wetlands are not under the Corps jurisdiction, the project applicant would be required to obtain a report of waste discharge from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Project construction activities could result in the direct removal or fill of wetlands in the project area. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-9 would ensure that potential impacts to wetlands are reduced to a less-than-significant level through the delineation of wetlands in the project area, avoidance of features where feasible and requiring no-net-loss of wetland functions and values. Impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

MM-4 *The City of Sacramento shall ensure that any ground disturbance (outside of existing rights-of-way) associated with installation or construction of any project component shall comply with the following requirements:*

- a) *Prior to the initiation of any ground-disturbing or vegetation-clearing activities or issuance of a grading permit, the City of Sacramento shall retain a qualified botanist to conduct surveys for special-status plant species and their habitat in the area of disturbance.*
- b) *The botanist shall conduct surveys for these special-status plant species at the appropriate time of year when the target species would be in flower and therefore*

clearly identifiable (i.e., blooming periods). Surveys shall be conducted following the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) approved protocol for surveying for special-status plant species.

- c) *If no special-status plants or their habitat are found during focused surveys, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter report to the City of Sacramento, and no further mitigation shall be required.*
- d) *If special-status plants are found, the following measures shall be implemented:*
  - *If the populations can be avoided, they shall be clearly marked in the field, using pin flags, by a qualified botanist for avoidance during construction activities. After the area has been marked, orange exclusion fencing shall be installed a minimum of one foot away from the pin-flagged locations. The location of the plant population shall also be recorded on construction plans and specs.*
  - *If special-status plant populations cannot be avoided, consultations with CDFG and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) shall be required depending on the listing status of the species present. These consultations shall determine appropriate mitigation measures for any populations that would be affected by implementation of the proposed project. Appropriate measures may include the creation of offsite populations through seed collection or transplanting, preservation and enhancement of existing populations, or restoration or creation of suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to compensate for the impact. The results of the consultation with CDFG and/or the USFWS shall be provided to the City.*

MM-5 *The City of Sacramento shall ensure that any ground disturbance or construction of project improvements comply with the following requirements:*

- a) *Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City of Sacramento, in consultation with the USFWS, shall either (1) conduct a protocol-level survey for federally-listed vernal pool crustaceans, or (2) assume presence (without conducting surveys) of federally-listed vernal pool crustaceans in all suitable wetland habitat within 250 feet of construction activities. Surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists in accordance with the most recent USFWS guidelines or protocols to determine the time of year and survey methodology (survey timing for these species is dependent on yearly rainfall patterns and seasonal occurrences, and is determined on a case-by-case basis). The surveys may be done as part of the Clean Water Act 404 permit process. The results of the survey shall be summarized in a "90-day Report" as required in current USFWS protocols, and submitted to the City and the USFWS.*

*The report(s) shall include at a minimum:*

- *A complete list of species observed in the vernal pools and seasonal wetlands.*
- *A detailed description of methodology, including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes and a list of references cited and persons contacted.*
- *Survey results that include at a minimum:*
  - *A map showing the location(s) of any federally listed vernal pool crustacean species identified within the project area.*

- A detailed description of any identified federally-listed vernal pool crustacean populations including information on the density, distribution and habitat quality relative to typical occurrences of the species in question.
  - A discussion of the importance of the population(s) with consideration of both nearby populations and total species distribution.
  - An assessment of significance related to project impacts on any federally-listed vernal pool crustacean populations identified in the project area.
- b) *If surveys within the project area reveal no occurrences of federally-listed vernal pool crustaceans, no further mitigation shall be required. However, if surveys determine that one or more federally-listed vernal pool crustacean species occurs within the project area, or if the City of Sacramento, in consultation with the USFWS, assumes presence of federally-listed vernal pool crustaceans in all affected pools, no net loss of habitat shall be achieved through avoidance, preservation, creation and/or purchase of credits. The selected measures may be part of the Clean Water Act 404 permitting process.*

- *Avoidance*

*Where feasible all wetland features shall be avoided. A USFWS-approved biologist shall monitor construction activities located within 250 feet of any wetland habitat within the project site to be avoided to ensure that no unnecessary take of listed species or destruction of their habitat occurs. The biologist shall have the authority to stop all activities that the biologist deems may result in such a take or destruction until appropriate corrective measures have been completed. The biologist also shall immediately report any unauthorized impacts to the USFWS and the CDFG.*

- *Compensation*

*The following or equally effective compensation measures shall be implemented as determined in consultation with the USFWS:*

- *For every acre of habitat directly or indirectly (habitat within 250 feet of construction activities) affected, at least two vernal pool preservation credits shall be dedicated within a USFWS-approved ecosystem preservation bank.*
  - *For every acre of habitat directly affected, at least one vernal pool creation credit shall be dedicated within a USFWS-approved habitat mitigation bank.<sup>27</sup>*
- *Water quality in the avoided wetlands shall be protected using erosion control techniques, such as silt fencing or straw wattles during construction in the watershed. This shall be completed in accordance with the State Construction Permit, as outlined in the NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002, Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. 99-08-DWQ.*

---

27 USFWS, Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects With Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office California, 1996, p. 3.

MM-6 *The City of Sacramento shall ensure that construction of all project improvements comply with the following requirements:*

- a) *Prior to any building demolition, the City of Sacramento shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a focused survey for bats and potential roosting sites in buildings to be demolished and/or buildings located within 50 feet of construction activities. If no roosting sites or bats are found within the project area, a letter report confirming absence shall be sent to the City of Sacramento and no further mitigation is required.*
- b) *If bats are found roosting at the site outside of nursery season (May 1<sup>st</sup> through October 1<sup>st</sup>), then they shall be evicted as described under (c) below. If bats are found roosting during the nursery season, then they shall be monitored to determine if the roost site is a maternal roost. This could occur by either visual inspection of the roost bat pups, if possible, or monitoring the roost after the adults leave for the night to listen for bat pups. If the roost is determined to not be a maternal roost, then the bats shall be evicted as described under (c). Because bat pups cannot leave the roost until they are mature enough, eviction of a maternal roost cannot occur during the nursery season. A 250-foot (or as determined in consultation with CDFG) buffer zone shall be established around the roosting site within which no construction shall occur. This boundary shall be added to the construction plans and specs. Depending on the location, and in order to not adversely affect ongoing residential and commercial activities, the boundary shall be marked using stakes and environmental flagging, or another method determined to be appropriate in consultation with CDFG.*
- c) *Eviction of bats shall be conducted using bat exclusion techniques, developed by Bat Conservation International (BCI) and in consultation with CDFG, that allow the bats to exit the roosting site but prevent re-entry to the site. This would include but not be limited to the installation of one way exclusion devices. The devices shall remain in place for seven days and then the exclusion points and any other potential entrances shall be sealed. This work shall be completed by a BCI recommended exclusion professional.*

MM-7 *The City of Sacramento shall ensure that all project improvements comply with the following requirements:*

- a) *For construction activities proposed within 500 feet of a potential nesting tree, undeveloped habitat, or under US 50 during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused preconstruction surveys for protected birds, including, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, white tailed kite and purple martin and other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Surveys shall occur within 30 days before the onset of construction. A pre-construction survey report shall be submitted to CDFG and the City of Sacramento that includes, at a minimum: (1) a description of the methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, and a list of references cited and persons contacted; and (2) a map showing the location(s) of any bird nests observed on the project area. If no active nests of MBTA, CDFG, or USFWS covered species are identified then no further mitigation is required.*
- b) *Should active nests of protected bird species be identified during the survey conducted in accordance with Mitigation Measure MM-7(a), the City of Sacramento in consultation with the CDFG, shall delay construction in the vicinity of active nest sites during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. A qualified biologist shall monitor any occupied*

nest to determine when the nest is no longer used. If construction cannot be delayed, avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with the CDFG, but shall be a minimum of 200 feet. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.

- c) If demolition/construction activities are unavoidable within the buffer zone, the City of Sacramento shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor the nest site to determine if construction activities are disturbing the adult or young birds. If abandonment occurs the biologist shall consult with CDFG or USFWS for the appropriate salvage measures. This could include taking any nestlings to a local wildlife rehabilitation center.

MM-8 The City of Sacramento shall ensure that the proposed project complies with the following requirements:

- a) The City of Sacramento shall have a tree survey or arborist report prepared for any project proposed in the project area that would affect existing trees to determine whether any heritage and/or city street trees would be affected.
- b) If no heritage and/or city street trees are present, no further mitigation is required.
- c) If heritage and/or city street trees are present, identified trees shall be preserved by installing temporary fencing 5 feet beyond the drip line of protected trees to minimize disturbance to the trees and their root zones in accordance with the Sacramento City Code, Chapter 12.64 Heritage Trees. Fences shall be maintained until all project activities are complete. No grading, trenching, or movement of heavy equipment shall occur within fenced areas.
- d) If removal of the heritage and/or city street trees or construction within 5 feet of the drip line cannot be avoided, a permit under Chapter 12.64.050 of the Sacramento City Code shall be obtained by the City of Sacramento prior to construction or ground disturbance. All requirements of the permit shall be implemented.

MM-9 a) The City of Sacramento shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a wetland delineation of the project area if wetland areas are present. This delineation shall be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and verification received prior to the issuance of any grading permits.

- b) The City of Sacramento shall, where feasible, preserve the maximum amount of existing wetlands and other waters of the U.S., and establish a minimum 25 to 50 foot buffer around all sides of these features. In addition, the final project design shall not cause significant changes to the pre-project hydrology, water quality or water quantity in any wetland that is to be retained on-site. This shall be accomplished by avoiding or repairing any disturbance to the hydrologic conditions in the watersheds that specifically support these wetlands, as verified through wetland protection plans.
- c) Where avoidance of existing wetlands and other waters of the U.S. is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be implemented for the project-related loss of any existing wetlands on-site, such that there is no-net-loss of wetland acreage or habitat value. Wetland mitigation shall be developed as a part of the CWA Section 404 permitting process or the report of waste discharged prepared for the SWRCB. The exact mitigation ratio is variable, based on the type and value of the wetlands affected by the project, but agency standards typically require a minimum of 1:1 for preservation

*and 1:1 for construction of new wetlands. In addition, a wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed that includes the following:*

- *Descriptions of the wetland types, and their expected functions and values;*
- *Performance standards and monitoring protocol to ensure the success of the mitigation wetlands over a period of five years;*
- *Engineering plans showing the location, size and configuration of wetlands to be created or restored;*
- *An implementation schedule showing that construction of mitigation areas will commence prior to or concurrently with the initiation of construction; and*
- *A description of legal protection measures for the preserved wetlands (i.e., dedication of fee title, conservation easement, and/or an endowment held by an approved conservation organization, government agency or mitigation bank).*
- *The mitigation and monitoring plan shall be approved by the Corps or SWRCB (as appropriate), prior to construction related impacts on any existing wetland.*

## **Findings**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-4 through MM-7 would result in less-than-significant impacts to special-status species and/or their habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-8 would result in less-than-significant impacts to heritage and/or city street trees while implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-9 would result in less-than-significant impacts to wetlands. No additional environmental analysis is required.

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

### Environmental Setting

Standard municipal energy distribution services serve the project area. Gas service is provided by PG&E and electric service is provided by Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Service from both providers is available within the project area and no known constraints or capacity problems exist.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project requires or results in the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, natural gas or electric facilities, the construction of which causes significant environmental effects.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

#### Questions A through C: Energy

Some electrical power could be required to supply street lights that could be constructed as part of roadway extensions or sidewalk improvements. However, the energy required for that operational use would be minimal and the construction of these new street lights would not cause significant environmental effects. Natural gas would not be used for either the construction or operation of the proposed transportation facilities. The proposed project involves transportation and circulation improvements and would not result in new land uses that require additional natural gas or electricity. Therefore, impacts on natural gas and electric facilities would be ***less than significant***.

### Findings

The project would not result in impacts to electrical or natural gas systems. Impacts to energy systems are anticipated to be less than significant. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>10. HAZARDS</b> <i>Would the proposal involve:</i>				
A) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?				<b>X</b>
B) Possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?				<b>X</b>
C) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?			<b>X</b>	
D) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?			<b>X</b>	
E) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?				<b>X</b>

## Environmental Setting

The project area contains a range of uses including light industrial, residential, office, warehouse, open storage yards, park land, and vacant areas. Hazardous materials stored on-site at the business or used in current activities and operations within the project area include fuel in aboveground and underground storage tanks, oil, waste oil, solvents, paints and thinners, printing materials, office materials, pesticides, and household maintenance materials. In addition, SMUD transformers within the project area may contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and older buildings within the project area are likely to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and/or lead-based paint.<sup>28</sup> Several sites in the project area have been identified by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) or the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) as having hazardous substance releases or leaking underground fuel tanks (LUFTs).<sup>29</sup>

Listed or suspected hazardous materials sites adjacent to proposed improvements include the U-Haul Center of 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Union 76 Service Station, ARCO Service Station, Top Hat Cleaners, Fong and Fong Printers (would be removed as part of the extension of Broadway under Scenarios B and C), Sacramento City Unified School District Bus Storage (adjacent to San Joaquin Street extension under Scenario B), Dorris Lumber & Moulding Company (adjacent to Redding Avenue extension north to Q Street under Scenarios B and C), and a possible former rail depot site.<sup>30</sup> Known hazardous materials sites within the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan include a gas station on 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Fence World, Inc., a Caltrans yard, CA

28 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, p. 5.5-1.

29 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, p. 4.6-2.

30 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, Appendix C, p. 5.5-10, Exhibit 5.5-2

Lumber Company, All Signs, Inc., Pittsburgh Paint, Eagle Gas, A&A Carpets, and JC Parts Distribution.<sup>31</sup> Fong and Fong Printers, which could have asbestos or lead-based paint, is a business use that could be removed under Scenarios B and C. A LUFT is not known to occur at that site.

The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) is the state agency responsible for toxic substance regulations. The County Environmental Management Department is responsible for maintaining a listing of toxic sites and their status in the County of Sacramento.

An area south of Ramona Avenue and north of 14th Avenue, east of the railroad tracks, and west of Power Inn Road is the site of a former landfill (east pit of the 14th Street Landfill) that operated from 1973 to 1976. The landfill was located on the site of a former open-pit gravel mine which ceased operation in 1962. Waste disposed of at the landfill included a wide variety of commercial construction and landscaping businesses, as well as, an unknown quantity of non-inert solid wastes from household garbage. The pit was converted to a landfill. Operations ceased once the pit was filled. The landfill did not contain base liners or a containment system, which were not required while the landfill was in operation.

Landfill gas (methane, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and hydrogen sulfide) generated by the decaying waste in the landfill continue to be produced by decomposition of the waste. Methane gas monitoring wells and sampling stations were installed in the area of the former landfill and continue to operation. Monitoring shows that the gases are migrating in concentrations that exceed regulatory limits. Landfill gas production rates are directly proportional to the moisture content of the wastes; therefore, it is important that the area of the former landfill be covered with an impervious cap to prevent moisture entering the landfill and allow the materials to dry, thereby resulting in a cessation of gas production. The California Integrated Waste Management Board is responsible for the gas sampling and analyses and forwarding the information to the County Local Enforcement Agency.

There are also three groundwater monitoring wells in the area of the former landfill. The compounds of concern include metals and petroleum hydrocarbons.

## **Standards of Significance**

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

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

## **Answers to Checklist Questions**

### **Questions A: Accidental Release**

Construction of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) would involve the use of various products that could contain materials classified as hazardous (e.g., solvents,

---

31 City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, December 2001, p. 6.5-4, Table 6.5-1.

adhesives and cements, certain paints, cleaning agents and degreasers). Fuels, such as gasoline and diesel, would also be used in heavy equipment and other construction vehicles. The potential for spills or inadvertent releases of hazardous materials during construction that could adversely affect people or the environment would be minimal. The use and storage of such products is subject to applicable hazardous materials regulations. Standard contract specifications would also contain specific provisions regarding the use of these products and compliance with applicable regulations and standards. Because applicable hazardous materials laws and regulations would be implemented as standard procedure for the proposed project through contractor specifications and monitored by the contractor and City staff, the impact of construction-related hazardous chemical use and storage would be less than significant.

Operation of the transportation improvements over the long-term would not result in any additional risks along area roadways than what currently exists because additional traffic carrying hazardous materials is not expected to occur as a result of the proposed transportation improvements. Current traffic volumes along project area roadways would remain approximately the same as under existing conditions. The percentage of vehicles transporting hazardous materials would be approximately the same under the proposed project as under existing conditions because the proposed project would not change land uses in the project area.

Potential impacts resulting from accidental release of hazardous materials would be ***less than significant***.

#### **Question B: Emergency Evacuation Plan**

During project construction it may be necessary to restrict travel on certain roadways within the project area to facilitate construction activities such as demolition, material hauling, construction, equipment staging, and modifications to existing infrastructure. Such restrictions could include lane closures, lane narrowing, and detours, which would be temporary, but could continue for extended periods of time. Lane restrictions, closures, and/or detours could cause an increase in traffic volumes on adjacent roadways. In the event of an emergency, emergency response access or response times could be adversely affected. To prevent interference with emergency response, the City requires all development projects to prepare Traffic Management Plans for construction activities, as required by sections 12.20.020 and 12.20.030 of the Sacramento Municipal Code. Compliance would ensure that construction impacts interfering with emergency response are minimized by identifying alternative emergency routes, if necessary, during construction.

Operational conditions are expected to enhance emergency evacuation routes by extending roadways and providing more evacuation options.

Therefore, the impact would be ***less than significant***.

#### **Questions C and D: Health Hazards**

Construction and operation of the proposed project could increase the amount of oil, grease, gasoline, and other contaminants on roadways and stormwater runoff could carry these contaminants into local waterways including surface water and groundwater. Please see Item 5, Water for a full discussion regarding water quality.

Asbestos and lead-based paint are substances that have been proven to cause deleterious health effects and were prohibited for use as construction materials by federal regulations

starting in 1981. Because the project area contains many buildings constructed before 1981, buildings in the project area may contain asbestos and/or lead-based paint, and implementation of Scenario B or C could result in the demolition of some of those structures.<sup>32</sup> The extension of 65<sup>th</sup> Street to the CSUS campus under Scenario B would remove a business along Elvas Avenue. The extension of San Joaquin Street from Redding Avenue to Ramona Avenue under Scenario B (separated-grade roadway) and Scenario C (pedestrian tunnel) would result in the removal of a building immediately east of the UPRR, near the intersection of Ramona Avenue and Cucamonga Avenue. The extension of Broadway from Redding Avenue to Ramona Avenue under Scenario C would remove a business that fronts Redding Avenue. The Broadway undercrossing would also remove a warehouse immediately east of the UPRR tracks along Ramona Avenue. The extension of 67<sup>th</sup> Street to the CSUS campus for a pedestrian/tram tunnel under Scenario C would remove two buildings along Elvas Avenue. Various regulations and guidelines pertaining to abatement of, and protection from, exposure to asbestos and lead have been adopted for demolition activities. These requirements include: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Rule 902 pertaining to asbestos abatement, Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to asbestos) and 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from Title 8 of the CCR, Part 61, Subpart M of the CFR (pertaining to asbestos), and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In California, asbestos and lead abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certifications from the State Department of Health Services. In addition, the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) has regulations concerning the use of hazardous materials, including requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, hazardous materials exposure warnings, and emergency action and fire prevention plan preparation. All demolition that could result in the release of lead and/or asbestos must be conducted according to Cal/OSHA standards.

The proposed project would involve excavation, which could expose workers or the public to soil that may have been contaminated by hazardous substance releases or leaking underground fuel tanks. The deepest excavation expected to occur as a result of the proposed transportation improvements (Scenario B and C) would be the railroad under crossings from Elvas Avenue to Sacramento State, from the Broadway extension to Ramona Avenue, and San Joaquin Street to Ramona Avenue. None of these improvements would extend through an area where there is a known LUFT.<sup>33</sup> Construction of the Ramona Avenue extension from the Ramona Avenue elbow to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue would extend through the former 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue Landfill site. As described above, the exposure of the waste to moisture would cause the production of potentially harmful gases such as methane, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and hydrogen sulfide. Excavation of soils contaminated by the landfill waste could also pose a health risk to the public. If any unidentified sources of contamination are encountered during demolition, grading, or excavation or if construction through the former 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue Landfill occurs, Mitigation Measures MM-10 and MM-11 would be implemented to reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level with mitigation incorporated***.

#### **Question E: Wildfire Risks**

The project area is located in an existing urban environment which does not include open wildlands subject to wildfires. Impacts would be ***less than significant***.

---

32 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, Appendix C, p. 5.5-13.

33 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, July 2004, Appendix C, p. 5.5-10, Exhibit 5.5-2

## Mitigation Measures

Consistent with Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(B) of the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Initial Study, Mitigation Measure MM-10 shall be implemented during all work associated with the proposed project's improvements.

*MM-10 If discolored soil, storage tanks, or other evidence of potential soil contamination is unearthed during construction-related earthwork, or if noxious odors are encountered during such earthwork, construction activities shall immediately cease at the construction site, and a qualified firm shall be called in by the applicant to collect and analyze soil samples from the construction site. If contaminants are identified in the samples, the applicant shall coordinate with the Sacramento County Hazardous Materials Division, or the appropriate agencies, for direction on appropriate remediation measures and procedures before construction activities are continued.*

Mitigation Measure MM-11 shall be implemented for work occurring on the site of the former 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue Landfill, including the extension of Ramona Avenue from the Ramona Avenue elbow south to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*MM-11 If construction occurs on the site of the former 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue Landfill, the developer shall:*

- a) Demonstrate to the satisfaction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) that the existing landfill cover will not allow wastes to be leached into groundwater.*
- b) If it can be demonstrated that the wastes are inert, no cover is needed.*
- c) If the wastes cannot be demonstrated to be inert, the developer shall demonstrate to the CRWQCB that precipitation will not percolate through wastes and cause a groundwater quality problem. Soil moisture sensors, excavation, or coring following rainfall could be used to determine the effectiveness of the existing pavement to prevent percolation.*
- d) The developer shall prepare a drainage map and submit it to the CRWQCB showing that all surface drainage is directed to runoff locations offsite. The map must also show that most of the rainfall leaves the site as runoff.*
- e) Any excess excavated soils must be disposed of at a California Integrated Waste Management Board-approved landfill.*
- f) If landfill waste is encountered during construction, construction work shall stop and the CIWMB Health and Safety Section shall be contacted for the proper course of action.*
- g) If groundwater is encountered during construction, construction work shall stop and the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board shall be contacted for the proper course of action.*

## Findings

With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-10 and MM-11 the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impact from hazards. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
11. <u>NOISE</u> <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
A) Increases in existing noise levels? Short-term Long Term		X		
B) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? Short-term Long Term		X		

### Environmental Setting

Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sound levels are usually measured and expressed in decibels (dB) with 0 dB being the threshold of hearing. Decibel levels range from zero to 140. Typical examples of decibel levels would be low decibel level of 50 dB for light traffic to a high decibel level of 120 dB for a jet takeoff at 200 feet.

The major sources of noise in the project area include traffic on local streets, US 50, the UPRR tracks, and, to a lesser extent, operation of Regional Transit's (RT) light rail transit system. Stationary noise sources, such as activity at industrial and commercial facilities, also contribute to the existing noise environment.<sup>34</sup>

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project results in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project's noise level increases;
- The project results in residential interior noise levels of  $L_{dn}$  45 dB or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- Construction noise levels exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- Existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- Adjacent residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- Historic buildings and archaeological sites are exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.

34 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 20, 2004, p. 4.4-3.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Questions A and B: Noise/Vibration

**Short Term Noise/Vibration Effects.** Temporary increases in existing noise and vibration levels would occur during construction of the proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C). Construction activities would require heavy equipment for trenching, grading, paving, and for the installation of project elements (i.e., signals, road extensions, and grade-separated under crossings).

The use of heavy construction equipment during construction could cause groundborne vibration that could exceed significance thresholds for construction activities and could affect nearby residences.

Generally, noise levels at construction sites can vary from 65 dB to a maximum of nearly 90 dB when heavy equipment is used nearby. Construction noise would be intermittent, and noise and vibration levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. The City exempts construction noise if it occurs between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday, and 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. on Sundays and public holidays as required by section 8.68.080(E) of the City Code. Construction noise and vibration would be perceptible to nearby residents. Therefore, the impact is **potentially significant** and will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Long Term Operational Noise Effects.** Implementation of the proposed project (Scenarios B and C) could affect vehicular traffic patterns in the area, including redistributing vehicular traffic to underutilized roadways. The proposed project would also result in extensions of roadways into areas where no roadway currently exist. For example, the extension of Broadway (under Scenarios B and C) would result in Broadway being extended adjacent to an existing multi-family residential complex where no roadway exists under current conditions. The increase in operational noise could exceed the City's allowable threshold for interior noise levels. Long term operational noise impacts could occur as a result of change in traffic patterns related to the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C). This is a **potentially significant impact** that will be analyzed in the EIR.

### Findings

The proposed project could result in significant short-term noise and vibration impacts and long-term noise impacts. A noise analysis based on the updated Traffic Impact Analysis/Study will be completed as part of the environmental review for this project. Potential noise impacts will be reviewed as part of the EIR.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>12. PUBLIC SERVICES</b> <i>Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</i>				<b>X</b>
A) Fire protection?				
B) Police protection?				<b>X</b>
C) Schools?				<b>X</b>
D) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				<b>X</b>
E) Other governmental services?				<b>X</b>

## Environmental Setting

The City of Sacramento provides police protection service within the project area. Fire protection and emergency medical services as well as first response hazardous materials services are provided by the City of Sacramento Fire Department. Schools in the project area are operated by the Sacramento City Unified School District.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project requires, or results in, the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, facilities related to the provision of fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Questions A – C, E: Public Services

The proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) would not generate a new population in the project area which would require new public services. Further, the proposed project would not remove or alter existing schools, or result in the need for new school facilities. Impacts would be ***less than significant***.

### Question D: Maintenance of Public Facilities

The City of Sacramento provides roadway maintenance (i.e., street re-surfacing, roadway damage repair) within the project area. The proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) would extend existing roadways within the project area. Under Scenario B or C, approximately no more than three linear miles of roadway would be added to the project area. These new roadways would either connect to, or widen, existing roads in the project area. Due to the relatively small amount of roadway to be added (compared to all the roads maintained within the city), combined with the nature of the existing street patterns in the area, and the

location of the improvements in a currently developed part of the city, it is anticipated that these improvements would not result in the need for a new or expansion of road maintenance facilities. Nor, would it significantly affect the City's ability to repair and maintain the existing roads within the project area. Impacts to roadway maintenance services would be ***less than significant***.

### **Findings**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to public services. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>13. UTILITIES</b> <i>Would the proposal result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</i>				<b>X</b>
A) Communication systems?				
B) Local or regional water supplies?				<b>X</b>
C) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?				<b>X</b>
D) Sewer or septic tanks?				<b>X</b>
E) Storm water drainage?				<b>X</b>
F) Solid waste disposal?				<b>X</b>

### Environmental Setting

The project area is located in a developed area within the eastern portion of the city. The City of Sacramento provides water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and solid waste disposal services to this area. Curbs, gutters, and stormwater facilities would be installed in new roadway widenings and extensions as a part of the proposed project. New utility lines for water supply and sewer service would also be constructed in proposed roadway extensions in coordination with the service providers.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project results in a detriment to microwave, radar, or radio transmissions;
- The project creates an increase in water demand of more than 10 million gallons per day;
- The project substantially degrades water quality;
- The project results in the determination of the wastewater treatment provider that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments;
- The project generates stormwater that would exceed the capacity of the stormwater system; or
- The project requires or results in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Questions A – D, F: Utilities

The proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C) include street extensions, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. These improvements would not construct tall structures (e.g., a high-rise building) that could interfere with microwave, radar, or radio transmissions. In addition, the proposed transportation improvements would not result in an increase in residential or employment population, and, therefore, would not create an increased demand for water, wastewater treatment, electricity, or solid waste disposal. The proposed project would, however, require the expansion of storm water drainage facilities, as discussed below under Item 13, Question E. Therefore, the proposed transportation improvements would not adversely affect public utilities. This impact would be ***less than significant***.

### Question E: Storm Water Drainage

As discussed under Item 5, Water, in this Initial Study, the proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) would introduce additional impervious surfaces to the area by providing new roadways, widened roadways, additional sidewalks, and vehicular and/or bicycle under crossings. The project would add approximately three linear miles in new roadway construction. The project area drains to Sump 31 and Sump 113. As a result of the increase in impervious surfaces, there would be an increase in runoff, but runoff patterns and volumes would remain substantially unchanged. However, as discussed under Item 5, Water, the of 69th Street to connect Elvas Avenue directly with Redding Avenue with the addition of a signalized intersection at Folsom Boulevard (Scenario B) could add enough stormwater runoff to Sump 113 to cause operational difficulties. Please see Item 5, Water for a full discussion regarding potential impacts to Sump 113. All new roadways would be designed to city standards and include stormwater drainage features built in to the street section including curbs, gutters, and stormwater facilities.

Mitigation proposed in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan EIR and the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR would not apply because the mitigation is based on specific land uses that support a new population. Although the proposed project would change existing drainage patterns through development of new roadway connections, sidewalks, and bike paths, the proposed project would be required to upgrade and install necessary storm drain infrastructure to handle additional runoff generated by the project. Therefore, stormwater drainage impacts would be ***less than significant***.

### Findings

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to public utilities. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
14. <u>AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE</u> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				X
A) Affect a scenic vista or adopted view corridor?				X
B) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?				X
C) Create light or glare?				X

### Environmental Setting

The project area is located in a developed area within the eastern portion of the city. Views of the project area are from US 50, Folsom Boulevard, 65<sup>th</sup> Street, and Power Inn Road/Howe Avenue. Existing views from the project area are limited by the existing built-up environment. The project area is not within a scenic vista or an adopted view corridor.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project casts glare in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time; or
- The project casts light onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

#### Question A and B: Scenic Vista and Views

The proposed project consists of transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C), including street extensions, pedestrian and bike pathways, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. Grade-separated under crossings would occur within the center of the project area, surrounded by existing and planned development. No scenic views exist either to or from the project area due to the urban nature of the environment. Existing views either within the project area or views of the project area would be substantially altered as a result of the proposed improvements. In addition, the roadway improvements would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings because the area is presently urbanized and contains roadways, buildings, and streetlights. Therefore, the proposed transportation improvements would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista nor would it have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### Question C: Light and Glare

The proposed project would consist of transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C), including street extensions, pathways, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings, which would result in the installation of street lights and traffic signals. As a result, the

amount of light that would be generated compared to what currently exists in the project area would increase. In adherence with adopted City standards, all proposed lighting would be limited to the amount required to safely light roadways, sidewalks and pathways. Lighting would be installed at the lowest allowable height and would be screened and directed away from sensitive uses (i.e., low-density single-family residential uses to the west of 65<sup>th</sup> Street and medium-density multi-family uses to the east of 65<sup>th</sup> Street).

Light reflections from reflective surfaces cause glare. During daylight hours the generation of glare depends upon the intensity and direction of sunlight. Artificial lighting can cause glare at night. The project does not propose the installation or construction of elements with reflective surfaces and; therefore, would not result in glare that causes public hazards or annoyance for a sustained period of time. For the reasons listed above, new lighting established on the site would not result in substantial increases in light or glare that would affect any light sensitive uses on or near the site. Impacts would be ***less than significant***

### **Findings**

No scenic vistas or views would be impacted by development of the proposed transportation improvements. Although the proposed transportation improvements would introduce a new source of light to the project area, adherence with adopted City standards would ensure that lighting impacts would be minimal. Aesthetics, light, and glare impacts are less than significant and no additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
<b>15. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<i>Would the proposal:</i>				
A) Disturb paleontological resources?			<b>X</b>	
B) Disturb archaeological resources?			<b>X</b>	
C) Affect historical resources?			<b>X</b>	
D) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?				<b>X</b>
E) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?				<b>X</b>

## Environmental Setting

The Sacramento Valley has a rich history of settlement by prehistoric Native Americans. Two distinct language groups occupied the lower Sacramento Valley, the Nisenan and the Plains Miwok. These groups survived through collection of plant foods, fishing and hunting. Areas along the Sacramento and American Rivers provided ideal habitat for a wide range of plant and animal resources. The project area is considered to have low sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources.<sup>35</sup>

Approximately 59 sites in Sacramento have been included in the National Register<sup>36</sup> and approximately 99 sites have been included in the State Register. None of these sites are located within the project area.<sup>37</sup> In addition, the city of Sacramento has 27 designated Historic Districts and two Special Planning Districts. Neither the project area nor any portion of the project area is located within the boundaries of any of these districts.<sup>38</sup>

The Sacramento Valley Railroad (SVRR) (now known as the UPRR) runs northwest-southeast through the project area, creating the eastern edge of the project site north of US 50 and nearly bisecting the project area south of US 50. The SVRR, the first railroad in California, was organized in August 1852. Work was completed in February 1856, when the SVRR extended from Sacramento to Folsom. The first train using the line consisted of three platform cars and an engine. The SVRR Company was relatively short lived. A segment of the SVRR line is within the project area near the intersection of the rail line and US 50. This segment was previously recorded as resource CA-SAC-428H. The SVRR was previously evaluated and found eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The SVRR alignment in this area was adapted for use as part of the Sacramento Regional Transit District's light rail system in the 1980s. In August 1865 the newly formed Central Pacific Railroad Company (CPRR) purchased the SVRR.

35 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, Figure 6.3-1.

36 National Register of Historic Places, <[www.nps.gov/nr/research/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/nr/research/index.htm)>, accessed February 20, 2009.

37 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, Figure 6.3-2.

38 City of Sacramento, General Plan Update Technical Background Report, June 2005, Figure 6.3-3.

There are several buildings in the project area that are at least 45 years old, including residential, commercial, and industrial buildings.<sup>39</sup> However, none have been designated as protected historic resources on the National Register or State Register. No buildings in the project area are on the City's list of historic buildings. The buildings in the project area that were constructed in the 1950s and 1970s are less likely to be determined significant because of their more recent construction dates and architectural similarity.<sup>40</sup> For implementation of the proposed project (Scenarios B and C), buildings would only be removed if they were within the planned path of roadway extensions or realignments. Roadway extensions that could occur include Ramona Avenue north to Folsom Boulevard (Scenarios B and C), Ramona Avenue south to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Scenarios B and C), 69<sup>th</sup> Street realignment between Elvas Avenue and Redding Avenue (Scenario B), San Joaquin Street east to Ramona Avenue (Scenario B), Broadway east to Redding Avenue (Scenario B), Broadway east to Ramona Avenue (Scenario C), 65<sup>th</sup> Street north from Elvas Avenue to State University Drive (Scenario B), and a new "68<sup>th</sup> Street" between Elvas Avenue and Q Street (Scenario C) (see Figures 3-10 and 3-12 in the EIR). All of these roadway extensions would require the removal of existing buildings. The extension of 65<sup>th</sup> Street to the CSUS campus under Scenario B would remove a business along Elvas Avenue. The extension of San Joaquin Street from Redding Avenue to Ramona Avenue under Scenario B (separated-grade roadway) and Scenario C (pedestrian tunnel) would result in the removal of a building immediately east of the UPRR, near the intersection of Ramona Avenue and Cucamonga Avenue. The extension of Broadway from Redding Avenue to Ramona Avenue under Scenario C would remove a business that fronts Redding Avenue. The Broadway undercrossing would also remove a warehouse immediately east of the UPRR tracks along Ramona Avenue. The extension of 67<sup>th</sup> Street to the CSUS campus for a pedestrian/tram tunnel under Scenario C would remove two buildings along Elvas Avenue.

## Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project causes a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or
- The project directly or indirectly destroys a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Questions A and B: Paleontological and Archeological Resources

Although the project area is not known to contain paleontological and archeological resources, earthwork associated with the proposed transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C), including street extensions, pathways, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings could uncover previously unknown resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-12 (which is consistent with Mitigation Measure 5.8-2 in the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR) would ensure that archeological and paleontological archeological resources discovered during project construction would be protected. Impacts would be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***.

---

39 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft EIR, July 2004, pp. 5.8-6 – 5.8-10.

40 City of Sacramento, South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan Draft EIR, July 2004, p. 5.8-7.

## Question C: Historic Resources

There are no protected historic structures or resources within the project area. The SVRR rail line within the project area is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Under Scenarios B and C, the rail line would not be altered; no direct impact to the rail line would occur as a result of the proposed transportation improvements. The element of the rail line that would change due to implementation of the proposed transportation improvements, however, would be the setting. The setting in the area has been significantly altered by previous urban development. Therefore, additional changes to the setting as proposed by Scenarios B and C would not result in a significant change to the rail line's setting.

Although several buildings in the project area would be demolished as a result of the proposed project, only two potentially historic buildings would be demolished. One commercial building at 3009 65th Street, which would be adjacent to the proposed Broadway extension, would be demolished as a result of the Broadway extension (Scenarios B and C). A commercial building at 6655 Elvas Avenue constructed circa 1952<sup>41</sup> would be demolished with the extension of a pedestrian/tram tunnel from 67th Street to the Sacramento State campus under Scenario C. Although these buildings are not listed as historic in the CRHR, they are older than 45 years old and could potentially qualify. Buildings that are currently 45 years of age or older or buildings that would be 45 years of age or older at project buildout would need to be evaluated prior to demolition.

If these buildings are eligible for listing in the CRHR, any damage or destruction to the buildings associated with project construction activities would represent a *significant impact*. Although demolition of these buildings would constitute a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.8-4 of the South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan EIR (MM-13), applied to the proposed project, would ensure that potentially eligible historic resources are documented and/or preserved. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-12 would reduce the project's impacts on historic resources to a ***less-than-significant level with mitigation incorporated***.

## Questions D and E: Ethnic Cultural Values and Religious or Sacred Uses

The project area contains no site with unique ethnic cultural values. The proposed project would consist of transportation improvements (Scenarios B and C), including street extensions, pathways, intersection realignments, and grade separated under crossings. Therefore, impacts to ethnic cultural values and religious or sacred uses would be ***less than significant***.

## Mitigation Measures

*MM-12 a) In the event that any prehistoric subsurface archeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, obsidian and/or mortars are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work within 100 feet of the resource shall be halted, and the City shall consult with a qualified archeologist to assess the significance of the find. Archeological test excavations shall be conducted by a qualified archeologist to aid in determining the nature and integrity of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archeologist, representatives of the City and the qualified archeologist shall coordinate to determine the appropriate course of action. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis and*

---

41 City of Sacramento, 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Draft EIR, December 2001, p. 6.6-7, Table 6.6-1.

*professional museum curation. In addition, a report shall be prepared by the qualified archeologist according to current professional standards.*

- b) *If a Native American site is discovered, the evaluation process shall include consultation with the appropriate Native American representatives.*

*If Native American archeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archeologists, who are certified by the Society of Professional Archeologists (SOPA) and/or meet the federal standards as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR 61), and Native American representatives, who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions.*

*In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. If historic archeological sites are involved, all identified treatment is to be carried out by qualified historical archeologists, who shall meet either Register of Professional Archeologists (RPA), or 36 CFR 61 requirements.*

- c) *If a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work shall stop within 100 feet the find, and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who shall notify the person most likely believed to be a descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the contractor to develop a program for re-internment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work is to take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have taken place.*

*MM-13 For any roadway widenings or extensions under the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Plan that could affect one or more potentially historic buildings, the City shall first have a CRHR eligibility evaluation prepared by a qualified historian. The evaluation shall occur through the preparation of DPR 523 forms for each building, and through standard CEQA evaluation.*

*For buildings determined to be eligible for listing: (1) reuse of these buildings should be considered over demolition; and (2) if demolition cannot be avoided, then the buildings shall be recorded to Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) standards before their removal. HABS/HAER recordation typically includes the following:*

- the development of site-specific history and appropriate contextual information regarding the particular resource (in addition to archival research and comparative studies, this task may involve limited oral history collection);*
- accurate mapping of the resources, scaled to indicate size and proportion of the structures;*
- photodocumentation of the designated resources, both in still and video formats; and*
- recordation by measured architectural drawings, in the case of specifically designed structures of high architectural merit; “as-built” plans of existing structures/foundation ruins will involve field measurements, office scaled plan layout, and plot out of final plan.*

- *Copies of the HABS/HAER documentation shall be filed with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Sacramento Archive and Museum Collection Center (SAMCC), and the Sacramento Room at the Central Branch of the Sacramento County Library.*

## **Findings**

With implementation of mitigation measures MM-12 and MM-13 the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts regarding cultural resources. No additional environmental analysis is required.

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
16. <u>RECREATION</u> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
A) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?				X
B) Affect existing recreational opportunities?				X

### Environmental Setting

Two community parks are located within the project area: Tahoe Park and Tahoe-Tallac Park. In addition, one regional park, Granite Park, is located adjacent to the project area to the east.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, a significant impact occurs if:

- The project causes or accelerates a substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities or
- The project creates a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the General and/or Community Plans.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

#### Questions A and B: Recreation

The proposed roadway improvements (Scenarios B and C) would not increase population or housing in the area or increase demand for recreation and park space. No new recreation facilities or expansion of existing recreation facilities would be necessary as a result of the proposed project. No public parklands or recreational facilities would be removed, deteriorated, or altered and would not be directly or indirectly impacted by the project. Impacts would be ***less than significant***.

### Findings

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to recreational resources. No additional environmental analysis is required.

## Mandatory Findings of Significance

Issues:	Impact within the Scope of the General Plan MEIR	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-Significant Impact
17. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>				
A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Disturb paleontological resources?			X	
B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?		X		
C. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X		
D. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

## Answers to Checklist Questions

### Question A: Habitat, Species, and Historical Resources

As described above under Item 8, Biological Resources, implementation of the proposed transportation improvements could result in significant impacts to species or habitats. However, Mitigation Measures MM-4 through MM-9 would ensure that those species and habitats are either avoided or any potential impact mitigated. As described under Item 15, Cultural Resources, two potentially historic buildings could be demolished or adversely affected as a result of the project. Also, previously undiscovered archeological or paleontological resources could be uncovered during project construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-12

and MM-13 would ensure that potential historic resources destroyed, or archeological or paleontological resources discovered, would be documented and preserved. Therefore, the impact would be ***less than significant with mitigation***.

#### **Questions B – D: Environmental Goals, Cumulative Effects, and Effects on Humans**

Potentially hazardous materials could be encountered during project construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-10 and MM-11 would ensure that potentially hazardous materials would be properly handled to avoid posing a health risk to the public.

As discussed above, air quality, noise, and transportation impacts all have the potential to have significant short-term (project-specific) and long-term (cumulative) effects on the environment and on human beings. Therefore, air quality, noise, and transportation impacts are ***potentially significant*** and will be discussed in the EIR.

#### Section IV – Potentially Affected Environmental Factors

The project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below:

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

**Section V – Determination**

Based on this Initial Study:

\_\_\_\_ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

\_\_\_\_ I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III were incorporated into the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

**X** I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

 for \_\_\_\_\_ Date 10/23/09

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Jennifer Hageman

Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_

## References Cited

- 1) City of Sacramento, *City of Sacramento General Plan Update Technical Background Report*, June 2005.
- 2) City of Sacramento, *City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*, July 2008.
- 3) City of Sacramento, *South 65<sup>th</sup> Street Area Plan*, Draft EIR, July 2004.
- 4) Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency, *65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Plan*, Draft EIR, February 2004.
- 5) City of Sacramento, *65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Study Existing Conditions Memorandum*, October 2007.
- 6) State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark*, Sacramento, California, May 2008.
- 7) City of Sacramento, *65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan*, Draft EIR, October 2002.
- 8) PBS&J, *65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Biological Resources Survey*, March 26, 2009.
- 9) Farber, Martin, City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, written communication, August 17, 2009.
- 10) National Register of Historic Places, <[www.nps.gov/nr/research/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/nr/research/index.htm)>, accessed February 20, 2009.
- 11) USFWS, *Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects With Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office California*, 1996.

