



**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development**

451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park Improvements
450 Jibboom Street
Sacramento, CA

Responsible Entity: City of Sacramento

Recipient: Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency

Preparer: Stephanie Green, SHRA Environmental Coordinator

Introduction:

In July 2010 the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Powerhouse Science Center Project, which included improvements to the Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park (Park). SHRA proposed to use \$300,000 in California Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for infrastructure improvements, and evaluated the full Powerhouse Science Center Project in their EA. It was found that the project would have no significant impact on the environment. The Authority to Use Grant Funds was received on August 23, 2010.

The City of Sacramento (City) now proposes to contribute \$800,000 in Choice Neighborhood Initiative (CNI) Critical Communities Improvements (CCI) funds to for the improvements to the Park. According to 24 CFR §58.2(a)(7), the City of Sacramento would be the Responsible Entity (RE) for the CNI funds and must prepare their own environmental review. 24 CFR §58.52 allows a RE to adopt another agency's EIS (interpreted by HUD to include EAs as well). The adopting agency must review the EA and revise/modify as required, and document the determination from the review and the decision to adopt.

This document is a review and re-evaluation of SHRA's 2010 EA, and includes any proposed changes to the project following completion of the original EA, and discusses any potential new impacts. In the sections of this EA that discuss compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities and Environmental Assessment Factors, the words "No Change" will indicate if there are no changes to that particular review factor following the proposed changes from the original 2010 EA. If the proposed changes result in new impacts, formal compliance steps, or mitigation, the review factor will include a discussion of those changes. The original EA is included for reference as Attachment A.

Project Location:

Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park is located at 450 Jibboom St, Sacramento, CA 95811. The overall Project Site is approximately 6.35 acres in size is comprised of 7 parcels (001-0190-005, 001-0190-004, 001-0190-011, 001-0190-016, 001-0190-015, portion of 001-0190-006, portion of 001-0190-009). The project location and acreage has not changed from the description in the original 2010 EA.

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

In the original 2010 EA, \$300,000 in federal funds were proposed to be used for infrastructure improvements to Jibboom Street to facilitate development of the Powerhouse Science Center Project. For the purposes of the original environmental review, in accordance with 40 CFR §1508.25(a) regarding connected actions, and 24 CFR §58.32 regarding aggregation requirements, both the infrastructure improvements and the Powerhouse Science Center were analyzed as one project. The bulk of the analysis focused on the potential impacts of the Powerhouse Science Center, which is the larger of the two actions.

The original project description for the Powerhouse Science Center project included rehabilitating the former PG&E Power station as the site for the main science center, and constructing new facilities including a planetarium, an educational center with a restaurant, and a parking structure. The project also included improvements to the Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park.

Since completion of the original EA in 2010, the addition of \$800,000 in federal CNI- CCI funds is proposed to fund the improvements to the Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park. Improvements to the Park are substantially similar to the improvements originally proposed, however, the plan has been better defined. Improvements to the Park will include: two new switchback pathways between Matsui Park and Powerhouse Science Center that meet ADA access requirements and will link into the existing walkway in Matsui Park; a stairway near the Jibboom Street sidewalk connecting to the park; a retaining wall shoring up the park to prevent erosion and help prevent liquefaction in the event of an earthquake; seat walls creating terraces on the land side slope of the levee; and lighting will be integrated into the sloped pathways, stairs and retaining walls.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

The purpose and need of the overall project remains the same, however the new federal funds will support improved access to the Robert T. Matsui Waterfront Park. Matsui Park was constructed at the height of the adjacent flood control levee meaning it is approximately 12 feet above street level which impairs access into the park from the Powerhouse Science Center and from Jibboom Street. The two new switchback pathways between Matsui Park and Powerhouse Science Center will meet ADA access requirements and will link into the existing walkway in Matsui Park, and a stairway near the Jibboom Street sidewalk will connect to the park. While not the primary purpose, the improvements would facilitate the access between the Powerhouse Science Center and Matsui Park at the proposed site.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The existing conditions and trends on the site have not changed. However, some of the original mitigation measures have already been completed, including removal of and mitigation for elderberry bushes and the wetland on site.

Compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are NEW formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flood map panel updated in 06/16/2015, panel number 06067C0157J. Project is still located in Zone X, an area with reduced flood risk due to levee. Flood Map included

Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]		as Attachment B.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5		
Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Mitigation for VELB has been completed. No elderberry bushes remain on site.</p> <p>This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. A new California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) search was conducted in order to determine the potential presence of federally listed species or critical habitat. An Official Species List for the project area was also obtained from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool. The lists of species from CNDDDB and USFWS were assessed for potential to occur in the project area based on habitat requirements and availability at the project site (see species occurrence table, CNND Map and Report, and IPaC Report included as Attachment C). The project site is located in an urban area and although the site is vacant, it functionally serves as an urban environment due to the high amount of human activity within the immediate vicinity. This type of site provides limited opportunity as habitat for federally-listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.</p>

<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Flood map panel updated in 06/16/2015, panel number 06067C0157J. Project is still located in Zone X, an area with reduced flood risk due to levee. Flood Map included as Attachment B.</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The Powerhouse Science Center project was reviewed for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act during the initial 2010 review. It was found that resources on the site are eligible for listing in the National Register. At the time of the original evaluation, SHRA had received concurrence from SHPO that the project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and, therefore, would not adversely affect the historic structures.</p> <p>Following the initial review and receipt of concurrence from SHPO, the developer was interested in potentially pursuing Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credits and therefore a Programmatic Agreement was developed between the SHPO, The City of Sacramento, and SHRA (included as Attachment D). The Programmatic Agreement delegates review of the project to the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit process and ensures that the project will follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and therefore not adversely affect the historic structures.</p> <p>In addition, an archaeological resources report was prepared for the project at the time of the original EA, and Mitigation Measures were included to prevent any impacts to archaeological resources. These</p>

		mitigation measures will still be adhered to. The finding regarding impacts to historic resources remains the same and no additional mitigation measures are required.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wetlands mitigation has been completed and there are currently no wetlands on site.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change.

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27] Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation

(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design		No change.
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff		No change.
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise		No change.
Energy Consumption		No change.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns		No change.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement		No change.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities		No change.
Commercial Facilities		No change.
Health Care and Social Services		No change.
Solid Waste		No change.

Disposal / Recycling		
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers		No change.
Water Supply		No change.
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical		No change.
Parks, Open Space and Recreation		No change.
Transportation and Accessibility	1	Accessibility will be improved with the ADA compliant switch-back pathways.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	Wetlands impacts on site have been mitigated for and there are no longer any wetlands on-site. No further impacts are anticipated.
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	VELB and Elderberry mitigation has been completed. No further impact is anticipated.
Other Factors		No change.

Additional Studies Performed: Following the initial EA prepared by SHRA, only an updated assessment of biological resources on the site was required. This assessment is discussed under “Endangered Species” above.

Field Inspection (Date and completed by): June 8, 2018 by Stephanie Green, SHRA Environmental Coordinator.

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). <http://bios.dfg.ca.gov>. Accessed 6/8/2018.

FEMA Flood Map Service Center (MSC). <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>. Accessed 5/2/2018.

Stephanie Green. Environmental Coordinator, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency. Phone call with Shannon Lauchner, Historian II, Local Government & Environmental Compliance Unit, California Office of Historic Preservation. 4/24/2018.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>. Accessed 6/8/2018.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Increased use of the space may contribute to poor air quality. According to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Sacramento County is designated nonattainment for the California State 1-hour and 8-hour and the federal 8-hour Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for ozone. A discussion of project impacts on air quality is included in the original EA beginning on Page 28.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

There will be no new impacts associated with the Matsui Park Project improvements.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

No new mitigation measures will be required. Please see the attached 2010 EA for list of mitigation measures that will be incorporated into this project.

