

City of **SACRAMENTO**

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
SERVICES

300 Richards Boulevard
Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, declare, and publish this Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following described project:

3200 Rio Linda Blvd Gas Station Project (P22-021) The proposed project proposes to rehabilitate the former gas station located on the proposed Project site. This includes both the retail building shell, gas station with canopy, and various site improvements at 3200 Rio Linda Boulevard. The proposed retail building is approximately 2,000 square feet (sf). The gas canopy is approximately 1,000 sf and includes 4 gas pumps. Site improvements would include parking stalls, an accessible path of travel to the right-of-way, trash enclosure, site lighting and landscaping, and various physical repairs to the structures. The gas station would sell gasoline only. No diesel sales are proposed.

The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento. The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, as identified in the attached Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code.

A copy of this document and all supportive is available on the City's EIR Webpage at:
<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports>

Environmental Services Manager, City of Sacramento,
California, a municipal corporation

By:

Scott Johnson

Date: August 31, 2023



3200 RIO LINDA BOULEVARD GAS STATION PROJECT (P22-021)

INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ANTICIPATED SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR

This Initial Study has been prepared by the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.* of the California Code of Regulations) and the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

SECTION I - BACKGROUND: Provides summary background information about the Project name, location, sponsor, and the date this Initial Study was completed.

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes a detailed description of the proposed Project.

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Reviews proposed Project and states whether the Project would have additional significant environmental effects (Project-specific effects) that were not evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan.

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have additional significant environmental effects.

SECTION V - DETERMINATION: States whether environmental effects associated with development of the proposed Project are significant, and what, if any, added environmental documentation may be required.

REFERENCES CITED: Identifies source materials used in the preparation of the Initial Study.

SECTION I - BACKGROUND

Project Name and File Number: 3200 Rio Linda Boulevard Gas Station Project (P22-021)

Project Location: 3200 Rio Linda Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95815
(APN) 251-0292-016

Project Applicant: Sarita Prasad
427 Santa Ana Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95738

Project Planner: Jose Quintanilla, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Environmental Planner: Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Date Initial Study Completed: August 2023

This Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 1500 *et seq.*). The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento.

The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed Project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed Project is an anticipated subsequent Project identified and described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR and is consistent with the land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the Project site as set forth in the 2035 General Plan. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15176 (b) and (d).

The City has prepared the attached Initial Study to review the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR to determine their adequacy for the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and identify any potential new or additional Project-specific significant environmental effects that were not analyzed in the Master EIR and any mitigation measures or alternatives that may avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance, if any.

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the Project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(d)) Policies included in the 2035 General Plan that reduce significant impacts identified in the Master EIR are identified and discussed. See also the Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan. The mitigation monitoring plan for the 2035 General Plan, which provides references to applicable general plan policies that reduce the environmental effects of development that may occur consistent with the general plan, is included in the adopting resolution for the Master EIR. See City Council Resolution Number 2015-0060, beginning on page 60. The resolution is available at

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

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

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

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Written comments should be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending October 2, 2023.

Please send written responses to:

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

SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION**PROJECT LOCATION**

The proposed Project is located at 3200 Rio Linda Boulevard in the City of Sacramento, California 95815 (Figure 1. Project Vicinity). The proposed Project site is within an urbanized portion of the City and is located on a developed parcel that contains a former gas station that is no longer functional (APN: 251-0292-016). Rio Linda Boulevard and Arcade Boulevard are both major collector roadways that border the western and southern boundaries of the proposed Project area, respectively.

The proposed Project site is located within the North Sacramento Community Plan Area. The 2035 General Plan identifies the land use designation within the Project area as Suburban Center Low and is zoned as C-2 – General Commercial (Figure 2. Land Use and Figure 3. Zoning).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project is the redevelopment of an existing gas station that was previously taken out of operation. The retail building was abandoned due to fire damage. The new construction is the rebuild and replacement of the former gas station, its retail building, and its enclosures. The gas equipment enclosure is approximately 1,000 square feet with four gas pumps for the sale of gasoline only. No diesel sales are proposed. The retail building is approximately 2,000 square feet. The redevelopment also entails other small site improvements such as installing parking stalls, an accessible path of travel to the right-of-way, trash enclosure, site lighting, landscaping, and various physical repairs to structures.

The proposed hours of operation for the gas station would be from 7 AM to 10 PM, 7 days per week. The hours of operation for the retail building have not yet been determined but would likely be similar to the hours of operation for the gas station.

The exterior lighting levels would be enough to ensure the safety of the facility, but to not provide glare or excessive light spillage onto adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.

Attachments

Figure 1 - Vicinity Map

Figure 2 - Land Use

Figure 3 - Zoning

Figure 4 - Site Plan

Appendices

Appendix A – Air Quality Report

Appendix B – Biological Resources Assessment

Appendix C – Wetland Memo

Appendix D – Cultural Report

Appendix E – Phase 1 ESA

Appendix F – Caltrans Unknown Hazard Procedures, Construction Manual 2006

SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**Introduction**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to examine the effects of a Project on the physical conditions that exist within the area that would be affected by the Project. CEQA also requires a discussion of any inconsistency between the proposed Project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

An inconsistency between the proposed Project and an adopted plan for land use development in a community would not constitute a physical change in the environment. When a Project diverges from an adopted plan, however, it may affect planning in the community regarding infrastructure and services, and the new demands generated by the Project may result in later physical changes in response to the Project.

In the same manner, the fact that a Project brings new people or demand for housing to a community does not, by itself, change the physical conditions. An increase in population may, however, generate changes in retail demand or demand for governmental services, and the demand for housing may generate new activity in residential development. Physical environmental impacts that could result from implementing the proposed Project are discussed in the appropriate technical sections.

This section of the initial study identifies the applicable land use designations, plans and policies, and permissible densities and intensities of use, and discusses any inconsistencies between these plans and the proposed Project. This section also discusses agricultural resources and the effect of the Project on these resources.

Discussion**Land Use**

The proposed Project site has been designated as **Suburban Center** in the 2035 General Plan, and is zoned as C-2 – General Commercial. The adjacent parcels to the east and south are low and high density residential, respectively. The parcel across Rio Linda Boulevard to the west is an active church. A levee for Arcade Creek is adjacent to the north of the site. The parcels surrounding the Project to the east, south, west and north are zoned as R-1 Single Family Residential, R-2B Multi Family, C2 – General Commercial, and F – Flood, respectively. The surrounding land uses are Suburban Neighborhood Low Density, Suburban Neighborhood High Density, and Parks and Recreation.

The proposed Project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community within the North Sacramento Community Plan Area. The Project is not located within any supplemental Opportunity Areas. Development of the site as proposed would alter the existing landscape, but the Project site has been designated for urban development in the 2035 General Plan and the Planning and Development Code, and the proposed development is consistent with these planning designations.

As outlined in the Sacramento City Code Title 17.216 of the Planning and Development Code Division II Zoning Districts and Land Use Regulations, C-2 Zone – General Commercial Zone is used to provide for the sale of goods, the performance of services, and limited processing and packaging. The proposed Project is consistent with C-2 zoning designation since the retail building and other amenities, such as the gas station, will be used for commercial purposes. The proposed Project would not impact the City's land use and planning objectives.

Population and Housing

The proposed Project would include the rehabilitation of a retail building shell, a gas station and enclosure, and site improvements. The Project site is located in a developed area and would not include

the extension of major infrastructure. Given the nature and scale of the development proposed, the Project would not be anticipated to create a large number of jobs or result in a large influx of new residents to the Project area. Rather, the Project is intended to serve the needs of the existing residences in the site vicinity. In addition, the proposed Project site does not contain any existing residences. As such, the proposed Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing or people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed Project would not result in impacts related to population and housing.

Agricultural Resources

The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development under the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.1. In addition to evaluating the effect of the general plan on sites within the City, the Master EIR noted that to the extent the 2035 General Plan accommodates future growth within the City limits, the conversion of farmland outside the City limits is minimized. The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

According to the NRCS Soil Survey Report, soils within the Project site contains are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (DOC 2023). The Project site does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance). (NRCS 2023). The site is not zoned for agricultural uses, and there are no Williamson Act contracts that affect the Project site. No existing agricultural or timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the Project site. Development of the site would result in no impact on agricultural resources.

Wildfire

The Master EIR does not identify any significant impacts related to wildfire risk. Per the CalFire and Resources Assessment Program (FRAP), the City is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The City is not located within or adjacent to a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Furthermore, the Project site is located within a developed area where a substantial wildland-urban interface does not exist. Thus, the risk of wildfire at the Project site is minimal. Based on the above, the proposed Project would not create a substantial fire risk for existing development in the Project vicinity.

1. AESTHETICS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project is located at 3200 Rio Linda Boulevard, at the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Arcade Boulevard (Figure 1). Both streets are major collector roadways. Land use in the vicinity is characterized as Suburban Center and Suburban Neighborhood Low and High Density (Figure 2). Local topography is relatively flat.

Existing conditions in the vicinity include roads, sidewalks, streetlamps, and Arcade Creek to the north of the site. Vegetation within the Project vicinity is mostly comprised of various ornamental grasses and trees used in landscaping. Public views of the Project site include views from motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians travelling on Rio Linda Boulevard and Arcade Boulevard, and residents who live in the area.

The Project site does not contain any scenic resources and is not contained within an area designated as a scenic resource or vista. Additionally, no scenic roadways are within or adjacent to the proposed Project site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The significance criteria used to evaluate the Project impacts to aesthetics are based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact related to aesthetics would occur if the Project would:

- substantially interfere with an important scenic resource or substantially degrade the view of an existing scenic resource; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare that is substantially greater than typical urban sources and could cause sustained annoyance or hazard for nearby sensitive receptors.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the general plan City of Sacramento, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2035 General Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.13, Visual Resources.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for light and glare (Impact 4.13-1) and concluded that impacts would be less than significant.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

Based on a field review by Soar Environmental, information provided by the applicant, existing information available to Soar Environmental, and observations made on the Project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- A) Would the Project create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance?

No additional significant environmental effect. The Project proposes to rehabilitate the former gas station onsite. During operation, there would be minimal change to existing light sources in the vicinity. The Project proposes new site lighting but would be designed to not provide glare or excessive light spillage onto adjacent properties or the public right-of-way. As such, the Project would not create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance. Although the proposed Project would result in an increase to the existing light sources during construction, the effects would be considered minimal, considering the existing urban, residential, and commercial uses of the surrounding area.

- B) Would the Project create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses?

No additional significant environmental effect. As mentioned above, lighting already exists throughout the Project vicinity since it's located in a highly urbanized area.

- C) Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings?

No additional significant environmental effect. Visually sensitive public locations include vantage points where a change affecting a scenic resource or the visibility of a scenic resource would affect the general public. Visually sensitive public locations within the City include major natural open space features such as the American River and Sacramento River, as well as important scenic resources including the State Capitol and historic landmarks such as the Old Sacramento Waterfront.

The proposed Project is located within an urbanized area. The proposed Project site is currently zoned C2 – General Commercial, which is similar to the parcel to the west of the proposed Project site and is within close proximity to residences and Arcade Creek. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially change the visual character of the area. Because the proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan, impacts related to aesthetics have been evaluated within the General Plan EIR. With adherence to General Plan policies, the development of the Project is not anticipated to substantially alter the existing visual character of the landscape. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with the applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

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

2. AIR QUALITY

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
2. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> Would the proposal:			
A) Result in construction emissions of NOx above 85 pounds per day?			X
B) Result in operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day?			X
C) Violate any air quality standard or have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing or Projected air quality violation?			X
D) Result in PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations that exceed SAMQMD requirements?		X	
E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)?			X
F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
G) Result in TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which is a valley bounded by the North Coast Mountain Ranges to the west and the Northern Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east. The terrain in the valley is flat and approximately 25 feet above sea level.

Hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters characterize the Mediterranean climate of the Sacramento Valley. Throughout the year, daily temperatures may range by 20 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs often exceeding 100 degrees and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches and snowfall is very rare. Summertime temperatures are normally moderated by the presence of the "Delta breeze" that arrives through the Carquinez Strait in the evening hours.

The mountains surrounding the SVAB create a barrier to airflow, which can trap air pollutants in the valley. The highest frequency of air stagnation occurs in the autumn and early winter when large high-pressure cells lie over the valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduces the influx of outside air and allows air pollutants to become concentrated in a stable volume of air. The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with temperature inversions that trap cooler air and pollutants near the ground.

The warmer months in the SVAB (May through October) are characterized by stagnant morning air or light winds, and the Delta breeze that arrives in the evening out of the southwest. Usually, the evening

breeze transports a portion of airborne pollutants to the north and out of the Sacramento Valley. During about half of the day from July to September, however, a phenomenon called the “Schultz Eddy” prevents this from occurring. Instead of allowing the prevailing wind patterns to move north carrying the pollutants out of the valley, the Schultz Eddy causes the wind pattern to circle back south. This phenomenon exacerbates the pollution levels in the area and increases the likelihood of violating Federal or State standards. The Schultz Eddy normally dissipates around noon when the Delta breeze begins.

Criteria Air Pollutants

Concentrations of emissions from criteria air pollutants (the most prevalent air pollutants known to be harmful to human health) are used to indicate the quality of the ambient air. Criteria air pollutants include ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), respirable and fine particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and lead. The sources of criteria air pollutants and their respective acute and chronic health impacts are described in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 Sources and Health Effects of Criteria Air Pollutants

Pollutant	Sources	Acute¹ Health Effects	Chronic² Health Effects
Ozone	Secondary pollutant resulting from reaction of ROG and NO _x in presence of sunlight. ROG emissions result from incomplete combustion and evaporation of chemical solvents and fuels; NO _x results from the combustion of fuels	Increased respiration and pulmonary resistance; cough, pain, shortness of breath, lung inflammation	Permeability of respiratory epithelia, possibility of permanent lung impairment
Carbon monoxide (CO)	Incomplete combustion of fuels; motor vehicle exhaust	Headache, dizziness, fatigue, nausea, vomiting, death	Permanent heart and brain damage
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)	Combustion devices; e.g., boilers, gas turbines, and mobile and stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines	Coughing, difficulty breathing, vomiting, headache, eye irritation, chemical pneumonitis or pulmonary edema; breathing abnormalities, cough, cyanosis, chest pain, rapid heartbeat, death	Chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function
Sulfur dioxide (SO ₂)	Coal and oil combustion, steel mills, refineries, and pulp and paper mills	Irritation of upper respiratory tract, increased asthma symptoms	Insufficient evidence linking SO ₂ exposure to chronic health impacts
Respirable particulate matter (PM ₁₀), Fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5})	Fugitive dust, soot, smoke, mobile and stationary sources, construction, fires and natural windblown dust, and formation in the Atmosphere by condensation and/or transformation of SO ₂ and ROG	Breathing and respiratory symptoms, aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, Premature death	Alterations to the immune system, carcinogenesis
Lead	Metal processing	Reproductive/developmental effects (fetuses and children)	Numerous effects including neurological, endocrine, and cardiovascular effects

Notes: NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; ROG = reactive organic gases.

1. “Acute” refers to effects of short-term exposures to criteria air pollutants, usually at fairly high concentrations.

2. "Chronic" refers to effects of long-term exposures to criteria air pollutants, usually at lower, ambient concentrations.

Source: EPA 2018

Existing Air Quality

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been charged with implementing national air quality programs. EPA's air quality mandates are drawn primarily from the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), which was enacted in 1970 and most recently amended by Congress in 1990. The CAA required EPA to establish the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the following criteria air pollutants: ozone, CO, NO₂, SO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and lead. CAA also requires each State to prepare a State implementation plan (SIP) for attaining and maintaining the NAAQS. The federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) added requirements for states with nonattainment areas to revise their SIPs to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. Individual SIPs are modified periodically to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins as reported by their jurisdictional agencies.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of State and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CCAA, which was adopted in 1988, required CARB to establish its own California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). CARB has established CAAQS for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, visibility-reducing particulate matter, and the above-mentioned criteria air pollutants. In most cases the CAAQS are more stringent than the NAAQS.

The SVAB is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS 8-hour ozone standard and the CAAQS for both 1-hour and 8-hour O₃ standard. The SVAB is also currently designated as nonattainment for both NAAQS and CAAQS 24-hour PM₁₀ standards. In addition, the SVAB is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard. The air basin is designated as unclassified or in attainment for the remaining criteria air pollutants (SMAQMD 2019).

Toxic Air Contaminants

According to the California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality (CARB 2013), the majority of the estimated health risks from toxic air contaminants (TACs) can be attributed to relatively few compounds, the most important being diesel particulate matter (diesel PM). Diesel PM differs from other TACs in that it is not a single substance, but rather a complex mixture of hundreds of substances. Although diesel PM is emitted by diesel-fueled internal combustion engines, the composition of the emissions varies depending on engine type, operating conditions, fuel composition, lubricating oil, and whether an emissions control system is being used. In addition to diesel PM, the TACs for which data are available that pose the greatest existing ambient risk in California are benzene, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, carbon tetrachloride, hexavalent chromium, para-dichlorobenzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, and perchloroethylene.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are generally considered to include those land uses where exposure to pollutants could result in health-related risks to sensitive individuals, such as children or the elderly. Residential dwellings, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and similar facilities are of primary concern because of the presence of individuals particularly sensitive to pollutants and/or the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to pollutants. The nearest sensitive receptors are the single-family residences adjacent to the property to the east and south. A church is located adjacent to the west. The nearest school to the Project site is Martin Luther King Jr. Technological Academy located approximately 0.33 miles southeast of the Project site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of 2035 General Plan policies:

- Construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day;
- Operational emissions of NO_x or ROG above 65 pounds per day;
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation;
- Any increase in PM₁₀ concentrations, unless all feasible Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been applied, then increases above 80 pounds per day or 14.6 tons per year. Any increase in PM_{2.5} concentrations, unless all feasible BACT and BMPs have been applied, then increases above 82 pounds per day or 15 tons per year;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour State ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm); or
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Ambient air quality standards have not been established for toxic air contaminants (TAC). TAC exposure is deemed to be significant if:

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.2.

Policies in the 2035 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.2 requires the City to review proposed development Projects to ensure that the Projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.4 and ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the 2035 General Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include ER 6.1.4, requiring coordination with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs, and impose appropriate conditions on Projects to protect public health and safety; as well as Policy LU 2.7.5 requiring extensive landscaping and trees along freeways fronting elevation and design elements that provide proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions from buildings.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) Result in construction emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day?

No significant additional environmental effect. Construction emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using CalEEMod version 2020.4. The modelling assumptions, inputs, and output file can be found in Appendix A of this document. The results of the modelling show that construction of the Project would result in up to 0.33 tons of NO_x annually (or 1.78 pounds of NO_x per day on average). Therefore,

construction of the proposed Project would not result in excess of 85 pounds of NOx per day. The Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

B) Result in operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day?

No significant additional environmental effect. Operational emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using CalEEMod version 2020.4. The modelling assumptions, inputs, and output file can be found in Appendix A. The results of the modelling show that operational emissions resulting from the Project would result in up to 0.51 tons of NOx annually (2.79 pounds per day on average), and 0.69 tons of ROG annually (3.78 pounds per day on average). Therefore, operational emissions as a result of the proposed Project would not result in excess of 65 pounds per day. The Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

C) Violate any air quality standard or have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing or Projected air quality violation?

No significant additional environmental effect. The proposed Project's daily and annual emissions of criteria air pollutants during construction and operation are shown in Table 3-2 and Table 3-3. All projected emissions are within the SMAQMD thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and the Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

TABLE 3-2 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (UNMITIGATED)

CONSTRUCTION YEAR	NO _x (PPD)	PM ₁₀ (TPY)	PM _{2.5} (TPY)
2024	0.3326	0.0238	0.0176
SMAQMD Thresholds	85	14.6	15
Maximum Emissions	2.9	0.1	0.1
Significant	No	No	No

NOTES:

NO_x is the oxides of nitrogen; PM_{2.5} is the particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; PM₁₀ is the particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD is the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; tpy is the tons per year

1. Project construction emissions estimates were made using the California Emissions Estimator Model, Version 2020.4.0. See Appendix A for model outputs and more detailed assumptions.
2. SMAQMD has established a zero-emissions threshold for PM10 and PM2.5 when projects do not implement SMAQMD's Best Available Practices.

SOURCES:

Data compiled by Soar Environmental Consulting in 2023; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 2023. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. Adopted December 2009, most recently updated April 2021.

TABLE 3-3 PROJECT OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (UNMITIGATED)

Source	ROG (tpy)	PM ₁₀ (tpy)	PM _{2.5} (tpy)
Area	0.0120	0.0000	0.0000
Mobile	0.6784	0.4581	0.1254
Total Emissions	0.6904	0.4581	0.1254
SMAQMD Thresholds	11.8625	14.6	15
Significant	No	No	No

NOTES:

ROG is reactive organic gases; PM_{2.5} is the particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; PM₁₀ is the particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD is the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; tpy is the tons per year

1. Project construction emissions estimates were made using the California Emissions Estimator Model, Version 2020.4.0. See Appendix A for model outputs and more detailed assumptions.
2. SMAQMD has established a zero-emissions threshold for PM10 and PM2.5 when projects do not implement SMAQMD's Best Available Practices.

SOURCES:

Data compiled by Soar Environmental Consulting in 2023; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 2023. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. Adopted December 2009, most recently updated April 2021.

- D) Violate any air quality standard or have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing or Projected air quality violation?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. The SMAQMD thresholds of significance for PM includes the following and apply to both construction and operational emissions:

- PM10: Zero (0). IF all feasible BACT/BMPs are implemented, then 80 lbs/day and 14.6 tons/year
- PM2.5: Zero (0). IF all feasible BACT/BMPs are implemented, then 82 lbs/day and 15 tons/year

Construction emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using CalEEMod version 2020.4. The modelling assumptions, inputs, and output file can be found in Appendix A. The results of the modelling show that construction of the proposed Project would result in 0.02 tons annually (0.12 pounds per day on average) of PM10 emissions and 0.02 tons annually (0.12 pounds per day on average) of PM2.5 emissions. Operational emissions of the proposed Project would result in 0.46 tons annually (2.52 pounds per day on average) of PM10 emissions and 0.13 tons annually (0.71 pounds per day on average) of PM2.5 emissions. With adherence to standard BMPs required with SMAQMD, as described in measure AQ-1, the proposed Project would not result in PM10 or PM2.5 concentrations that exceed SMAQMD requirements.

- E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)?

No significant additional environmental effect. Localized concentrations of CO, or “hot spots,” are primarily of concern for heavily congested roadways with stop-and-go traffic, particularly in areas with limited vertical mixing such as tunnels, long underpasses, or below-grade roadways. While the proposed Project would result in the rehabilitation of a retail building shell and a gas station and enclosure on a developed parcel in an urban area that may generate additional traffic on adjacent roadways, the impact would not be to a significant degree such that roadways would congest and cause an exceedance of the state’s 1-hour state ambient air quality standard for CO concentrations. The Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

- F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No significant additional environmental effect. Although construction of the Project would result in associated air pollutants, these increases are not concentrated and are well below significance thresholds as shown in the discussion above. Construction activities would be short term and intermittent in nature and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, adherence to standard dust control and construction BMPs would be required as part of the Project’s Construction Management Plan.

The structures and amenities built by this Project would be consistent with current safety code and would not result in operational emissions that would expose sensitive receptors to long-term substantial pollutant concentrations as shown in the discussion above. The Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

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

No significant additional environmental effect. The primary source for TACs typically result from diesel particulate matter (DPM) emitted from off-road equipment and on-road trucks. The proposed Project is the rehabilitation of a new retail building shell and a gas station and enclosure, which would not facilitate an increase in off-road equipment use or truck traffic.

Another source of TACs is gasoline vapors from fueling operations. Gasoline vapors include several substances considered toxic air contaminants by the state of California, including benzene, toluene, and a gasoline additive known as MTBE (methyl tertiary-butyl ether). The California Air Resources Board

(CARB) led the effort to certify gasoline vapor control systems and require their use starting in 1974. In 1990 the federal Clean Air Act amendments included requirements that vapor recovery systems at gas stations use CARB-certified equipment. The SMAQMD requires gasoline fueling stations to install and maintain vapor recovery systems. Within 30 calendar days of completion of construction or modification of any vapor recovery system, the operator must conduct and pass all applicable performance tests to receive a use permit. Reverification tests are required annually to maintain the use permit.

The 2022 CARB & CAPCOA Gasoline Service Station Industrywide Risk Assessment Look-up Tool provides estimated values for cancer risk and hazard index. These estimations are based on annual gasoline throughput, distance to sensitive receptors, and other similar factors. The proposed Project would not exceed 50,000 gallons of throughput annually. The results from this calculation can be seen in Table 3-4.

TABLE 3-4 2022 CARB & CAPCOA GASOLINE SERVICE STATION INDUSTRYWIDE RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Value	Results
Max Residential Cancer Risk (chances/million)	0.19
Max Worker Cancer Risk (chances/million)	0.01
Chronic Hazard Index	0.00
Acute Hazard Index	0.36

Source: 2022 CARB & CAPCOA Gasoline Service Station Industrywide Risk Assessment Look-up Tool, Version 1.0 – February 18, 2022, available at <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/gasoline-service-stationindustrywide-risk-assessment-guidance>, accessed on August 11, 2023.

As shown in Table 3-4, the proposed Project would not exceed a 10 in 1 million cancer risk from fueling operations. Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources. The Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

AQ-1: Implement SMAQMD Basic and Enhanced Construction Emission Control Practices to Reduce Fugitive Dust. The implementing agency will require, as a standard or specification of their contract, the construction contractor(s) to implement basic and enhanced control measures to reduce construction-related fugitive dust. Although the following measures are outlined in the SMAQMD's CEQA guidelines, they are required for the entirety of the construction area. The implementing agency will ensure through contract provisions and specifications that the contractor adheres to the mitigation measures before and during construction and documents compliance with the adopted mitigation measures.

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include (but are not limited to) soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- Cover or maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- All roadway, driveway, sidewalk, and parking lot paving should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ- 2: In accordance with the SMAQMD's CEQA Guidance, all Projects undergoing environmental review should implement the Tier 1 BMPs – even if they do not exceed the operational screening table in Chapter 4 of the CEQA guide.

- BMP 1 – Projects shall be designed and constructed without natural gas infrastructure.

If Project greenhouse gas emissions are over the 1,100 metric tons CO₂e/year after the Project applied Tier 1 BMPs, Tier 2 BMPs should be implemented.

- BMP 2 – Projects shall meet the current CalGreen Tier 2 standards, except all electric vehicle capable spaces shall instead be electric vehicle nearby.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to Air Quality can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:			
A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?		X	
B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal species?			X
C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Prior to human development, the natural habitats within the region included perennial grasslands, riparian woodlands, oak woodlands, and a variety of wetlands including vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, freshwater marshes, ponds, streams, and rivers. Over the last 150 years, agriculture, irrigation, flood control, and urbanization have resulted in the loss or alteration of much of the natural habitat within the City limits. Non-native annual grasses have replaced the native perennial grasslands, many of the natural streams have been channelized, much of the riparian and oak woodlands have been cleared, and most of the marshes have been drained and converted to agricultural or urban uses.

Though the majority of the City is developed with residential, commercial, and other urban development, valuable plant and wildlife habitat still exists. These natural habitats are located primarily outside the city boundaries in the northern, southern and eastern portions of the City, but also occur along river and stream corridors and on a number of undeveloped parcels. Habitats that are present in the City include annual grasslands, riparian woodlands, oak woodlands, riverine, ponds, freshwater marshes, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools. These habitats and their general locations are discussed briefly below.

Two structures exist on the proposed Project site; the retail building, and a sheltered gas pump area. The main building has been boarded up for two years, and the gas pumps remain on site. The proposed Project site is in an urban environment within the city limits of Sacramento, bounded by Rio Linda Boulevard to the west and Arcade Street to the south. The property is at approximately 35 feet elevation AMSL. Arcade Creek runs northeast to southwest approximately 120 feet north of the proposed Project site, which is otherwise surrounded by residential neighborhoods. The ground cover is mostly concrete with some ruderal weeds and grasses around the perimeter of the site.

The Arcade Creek watershed is a small, urbanized watershed bounded by a service road on both sides. It is a highly degraded stream ecosystem with severe water quality problems, is subject to moderate flood damage, and has significantly compromised habitat conditions. The urbanized nature of the landscape causes high loadings of toxicants, and the hot, dry summer climate creates high ambient temperatures in the creek and its tributaries. Related problems include high peak flows, excessive erosion, loss of riparian habitat, low dissolved oxygen levels, and low flows, resulting in negative impacts from invasive fish and plant species. These and other problems have virtually eliminated salmonids in the Arcade Creek watershed.

Based upon a review of the resources and databases described in the Biological Resources Assessment conducted for the proposed Project (Appendix B) it was determined that 27 special-status wildlife species, and 14 special-status plant species have been documented within 10 miles of the Project area. Of these 41 special-status species, 6 were determined to have reasonable potential for occurrence:

- 1) Burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*)
- 2) Purple martin (*Progne subis*)
- 3) Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*)
- 4) Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*)
- 5) Vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*)
- 6) Sanford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria sanfordii*)

The proposed Project site is in a highly disturbed urbanized area with little to no suitable habitat for any of the special status species identified in the BRA (Appendix B). Based on analysis of habitat conditions in the vicinity of the proposed Project site, all other special-status species identified in the data records search were found unlikely to occur in the proposed Project area. There was no apparent sign of occupancy of bat, bird, or small mammal species in the structures on site, and habitat conditions were not conducive for any of the identified special-status plant species.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be significant if any of the following conditions or potential thereof, would result with implementation of the proposed Project:

- Creation of a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected;
- Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal; or
- Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands).

For the purposes of this document, "special-status" has been defined to include those species, which are:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (or proposed for listing);
- Designated as endangered or rare, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 1901);
- Designated as fully protected, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 3511, 4700, or 5050);
- Designated as species of concern by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or as species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG);
- Plants or animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.3 of the Master EIR evaluated the effects of the 2035 General Plan on biological resources within the City. The Master EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the 2035 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2035 General Plan. Policy ER 2.1.5 calls for the City to preserve the

ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each Project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate; and Policy ER 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the California Department Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

The Master EIR discussed biological resources in Chapter 4.3. The Master EIR concluded that policies in the general plan, combined with compliance with the California Endangered Species Act, Natomas Basin HCP (when applicable) and CEQA would minimize the impacts on special-status species to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 4.3-1), and that the general plan policies, along with similar compliance with local, state and federal regulation would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level for habitat for special-status invertebrates, birds, amphibians and reptiles, mammals and fish (Impacts 4.3-3-6).

Given the prevalence of rivers and streams in the incorporated area, impacts to riparian habitat is a common concern. Riparian habitats are known to exist throughout the City, especially along the Sacramento and American rivers and their tributaries. The Master EIR discussed impacts of development adjacent to riparian habitat that could disturb wildlife species that rely on these areas for shelter and food, and could also result in the degradation of these areas through the introduction of feral animals and contaminants that are typical of urban uses. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regulates potential impacts on lakes, streams, and associated riparian (streamside or lakeside) vegetation through the issuance of Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreements (SAA) (per Fish and Game Code Section 1602), and provides guidance to the City as a resource agency. While there are no federal regulations that specifically mandate the protection of riparian vegetation, federal regulations set forth in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act address areas that potentially contain riparian-type vegetation, such as wetlands.

The general plan calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals and drainage ditches that support riparian resources (Policy ER 2.1.5) and wetlands (Policy ER 2.1.6) and requires habitat assessments and impact compensation for Projects (Policy ER 2.1.10). has adopted a standard that requires coordination with state and federal agencies if a Project has the potential to affect other species of special concern or habitats (including regulatory waters and wetlands) protected by agencies or natural resource organizations (Policy 2.1.11).

Implementation of 2035 General Plan Policy ER 2.1.5 would reduce the magnitude of potential impacts by requiring a 1:1 replacement of riparian habitat lost to development. While this would help mitigate impacts on riparian habitat, large open areas of riparian habitat used by wildlife could be lost and/or degraded directly and indirectly through development under the 2035 General Plan. Given the extent of urban development designated in the general plan, the preservation and/or restoration of riparian habitat would likely occur outside of the City limits. The Master EIR concluded that the permanent loss of riparian habitat would be a less-than-significant impact. (Impact 4.3-7)

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Result a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. Development of the Project area would result in the rehabilitation of a former gas station and retail building that would not result in the use , production, or disposal of new hazardous materials on-site. Furthermore, the Project is not anticipated to result in a potential health hazard that would pose a hazard to local plant or animal populations. Standard BMPs BIO-1 through BIO-4 would be implemented to avoid potential impacts to plants and animals.

- B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal species?

No significant additional environmental effect. A list of regional special status wildlife species with potential to occur within the Project vicinity was compiled from database searches of the USFWS IPaC, the

CNDDB, the CNPS Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and the NMFS species database. The potential for each species to occur within the Project area was determined by analyzing the habitat requirements of each species and comparing the habitat requirements to available habitat within the Project area. After a comparison between habitat requirements and the habitat available within the Project area, no special status species were determined to have the potential to occur within the Project area. The Project area is a developed commercial lot with a paved parking lot, and an abandoned and secured retail store. The Project area does not have any natural habitat suitable for special-status species. As such, the Project is not anticipated to result in the substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, or reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species. For more information, refer to Appendix B.

- C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?

No significant additional environmental effect. The Project site is a developed parcel that consists of paved concrete, barren land, and ruderal vegetation. In addition, the proposed Project is surrounded by existing development, paved areas, and other built landscapes. Arcade Creek, while being adjacent to the north of the site, is separated by a levee. No jurisdictional habitat occurs within the Project area; as such, the Project is not anticipated to affect regulatory waters or wetlands. Furthermore, no species of special concern are anticipated to occur within the proposed Project area.

MITIGATION MEASURES

BIO-1: Prior to arrival at the Project site and prior to leaving the Project site, construction equipment that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds will be cleaned to reduce the spreading of noxious weeds.

BIO-2: The contractor must dispose of all food-related trash in closed containers and must remove it from the Project Area each day during construction. Construction personnel must not feed or attract wildlife to the Project Area.

BIO-3: The contractor must not apply rodenticide or herbicide within the Project Area during construction.

BIO-4: If any wildlife is encountered during construction, said wildlife shall be allowed to leave the construction area unharmed.

FINDINGS

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

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the Project:			
A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?		X	
B) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource?		X	
C) Disturb any human remains?		X	

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento and the surrounding area are known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout the city. Human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric contexts. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources, as identified in the 2035 General Plan Background Report, are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses.

The 2035 General Plan land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and impacts on sensitive pre-contact and/or historic resources. High sensitivity areas may be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today. Recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the downtown area is highly sensitive for both historic- and prehistoric-period archaeological resources. Native American burials and artifacts were found in 2005 during construction of the New City Hall and historic period archaeological resources are abundant downtown due to the evolving development of the area and, in part, to the raising of the surface street level in the 1860s and 1870s, which created basements out of the first floors of many buildings.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, cultural resource impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed Project would result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; or
2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource; or
3. A substantial adverse change in the significance of such resources.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources. See Chapter 4.4.

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on Project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10) and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.14). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort. (Policy HCR 2.1.15)

The Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable effect on historic resources and archaeological resources. (Impacts 4.4-1, 2)

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?

Effects can be mitigated to less than significant. To identify any known cultural resources, a records search of Project area was conducted via the North Central Information Center (NCIC) and the California Historical Records Information search (CHRIS). This report is included as Appendix D. Using this data, previously recorded sites and previous surveys within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed Project area were reviewed.

The results of the records search indicate eight cultural resources recorded within 0.50-mile of the proposed Project area. The records searches indicate no recorded cultural resources within the proposed Project area. The proposed Project site is currently occupied by an inactive gas station, is partially undeveloped, and is surrounded by developed land within an urbanized area. The proposed Project site does not contain structures that could possibly yield important prehistoric or historic information. Given the heavily disturbed nature of the site, previously undiscovered cultural resources are not likely to occur onsite. Considering the geological history of the Project area and due to deep sedimentation during the Holocene in the region, however, unknown resources below the surface could be encountered during grading and excavation. Therefore, the proposed Project could result in additional significant environmental effects related to damaging or destroying prehistoric cultural resources beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would mitigate the impact to a less-than significant level.

- B) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource?

Effects can be mitigated to less than significant. Paleontological resources are not known or suspected on-site due to the geological age of the proposed Project area soils, and unique geologic features are not known to exist on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity. Due to the disturbed nature of the proposed Project site, the potential for encountering paleontological resources is low, however, it remains possible that earth-disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a paleontological site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would mitigate the impact to a less-than significant level.

- C) Disturb any human remains?

Effects can be mitigated to less than significant. Given the disturbed nature of the proposed Project site, intact cultural resources are not likely to be found on-site during grading and construction activities. However, due to the continuous occupation of the region as a whole, which includes thousands of years of occupation by Native American groups prior to non-Native peoples settling in the region, the possibility exists that previously unknown resources could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with development of the Project. If human remains are discovered during the construction of the Project, the implementation of measure CR-1 will ensure the appropriate procedures are followed to determine the nature of the remains.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR-1a: In the Event that Cultural Resources Are Discovered During Construction, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Impacts and Procedures to Evaluate Resources.

If cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the Project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the Project's City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.
- Recommendations for avoidance of cultural resources will be reviewed by the City representative and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with Project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the Project site to avoid cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource.
- If the discovered cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.
- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an "Environmentally Sensitive Area".

If a cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of cultural resources:

- Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources-(CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.

If a cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City. As part of the site investigation and

resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the Project record.

CR-1b: Implement Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during Project-related construction activities or Project planning, the City the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner's findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains. The responsibilities of the City for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

FINDINGS

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

5. ENERGY

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
5. ENERGY Would the Project:			
A) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?			X
B) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X

Energy

Structures built would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2035 General Plan includes policies (see 2035 General Plan Energy Resources Goal U 6.1.1) and related policies to encourage energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, coordination with local utility providers and recruitment of businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

The Master EIR discussed energy conservation and relevant general plan policies in section 6.3 (page 6-3). The discussion concluded that with implementation of the general plan policies and energy regulation (e.g., Title 24) development allowed in the general plan would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

See also Section 12, below, discussing impacts related to energy. The Master EIR concluded that implementation of state regulation, coordination with energy providers and implementation of general plan policies would reduce the potential impacts from construction of new energy production or transmission facilities to a less-than-significant level.

Environmental Setting

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is a community-owned and not-for-profit utility that provides electric services to 900 square miles, including most of Sacramento County (SMUD 2020). Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) is an inventory-owned utility that provides electric and natural gas services to approximately 16 million people within a 70,000-square-mile service area in both northern and central California (PG&E 2020). SMUD is the primary electricity supplier, and PG&E is the primary natural gas supplier for the City of Sacramento and the Project area.

Energy demand related to the proposed Project would include energy directly consumed for space heating and cooling and proposed electric facilities and lighting. Indirect energy consumption would be associated with the generation of electricity at power plants. Transportation-related energy consumption includes the use of fuels and electricity to power cars, trucks, and public transportation. Energy would

also be consumed by equipment and vehicles used during Project construction and routine maintenance activities.

Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and CAFE Standards

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 established nationwide fuel economy standards to conserve oil. Under this act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, is responsible for revising existing fuel economy standards and establishing new vehicle economy standards. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy program was established to determine vehicle manufacturer compliance with the government's fuel economy standards. Three Energy Policy Acts have been passed, in 1992, 2005, and 2007, to reduce dependence on foreign petroleum, provide tax incentives for alternative fuels, and support energy conservation.

Energy Policy Act of 1992 and 2005

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAAct) was passed to reduce the country's dependence on foreign petroleum and improve air quality. EPAAct includes several parts intended to build an inventory of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) in large, centrally fueled fleets in metropolitan areas. EPAAct requires certain federal, state, and local government and private fleets to purchase a percentage of light-duty AFVs capable of running on alternative fuels each year. In addition, financial incentives are also included in EPAAct. Federal tax deductions are allowed for businesses and individuals to cover the incremental cost of AFVs. States are also required by the act to consider a variety of incentive programs to help promote AFVs. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 provides renewed and expanded tax credits for electricity generated by qualified energy sources, such as landfill gas; provides bond financing, tax incentives, grants, and loan guarantees for clean renewable energy and rural community electrification; and establishes a federal purchase requirement for renewable energy.

State of California Energy Efficiency Action Plan

The 2019 California Energy Efficiency Action Plan has three primary goals for the state: double energy efficiency savings by 2030 relative to a 2015 base year (per SB 350), expand energy efficiency in low-income and disadvantaged communities, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from buildings. This plan provides guiding principles and recommendations on how the state would achieve those goals. These recommendations include:

- identifying funding sources that support energy efficiency programs,
- identifying opportunities to improve energy efficiency through data analysis,
- using program designs as a way to encourage increased energy efficiency on the consumer end,
- improving energy efficiency through workforce education and training, and
- supporting rulemaking and programs that incorporate energy demand flexibility and building decarbonization. (CEC 2019)

California Green Building Standards

The energy consumption of new residential and nonresidential buildings in California is regulated by the state's Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Code). The California

Energy Code was established by CEC in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. CEC updates the California Energy Code every 3 years with more stringent design requirements for reduced energy consumption, which results in the generation of fewer GHG emissions.

The 2019 California Energy Code was adopted by CEC on May 9, 2018 and applies to Projects constructed after January 1, 2020. The 2019 California Energy Code is designed to move the State closer to its zero-net energy goals for new residential development. It does so by requiring all new residences to install enough renewable energy to offset all the electricity needs of each residential unit (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 6, Section 150.1(c)4). CEC estimates that the combination of mandatory on-site renewable energy and prescriptively required energy efficiency standards will result in a 53 percent reduction in new residential construction as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code. Non-residential buildings are anticipated to reduce energy consumption by 30 percent as compared to the 2016 California Energy Code primarily through prescriptive requirements for high-efficiency lighting (CEC 2018). The Energy Code is enforced through the local plan check and building permit process. Local government agencies may adopt and enforce additional energy standards for new buildings as reasonably necessary due to local climatologic, geologic, or topographic conditions, provided that these standards exceed those provided in the California Energy Code.

Transportation-Related Regulations

Various regulatory and planning efforts are aimed at reducing dependency on fossil fuels, increasing the use of alternative fuels, and improving California's vehicle fleet. Senate Bill (SB) 375 aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG emission reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation. CARB, in consultation with the metropolitan planning organizations, provides each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in their respective regions for 2020 and 2035.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 2076 (Chapter 936, Statutes of 2000), CEC and the CARB prepared and adopted a joint agency report in 2003, Reducing California's Petroleum Dependence. Included in this report are recommendations to increase the use of alternative fuels to 20 percent of on-road transportation fuel use by 2020 and 30 percent by 2030, significantly increase the efficiency of motor vehicles, and reduce per capita VMT (CEC and CARB 2003).

AB 1007 (Chapter 371, Statutes of 2005) required CEC to prepare the State Alternative Fuels Plan to increase the use of alternative fuels in California.

In January 2012, CARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars program which combines the control of GHG emissions and criteria air pollutants, as well as requirements for greater numbers of zero-emission vehicles, into a single package of standards for vehicle model years 2017 through 2025. The program's zero-emission vehicle regulation requires battery, fuel cell, and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to account for up to 15 percent of California's new vehicle sales by 2025.

On August 2, 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA and EPA proposed the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule (SAFE Rule). Part One of the SAFE Rule revokes a waiver granted by EPA to the State of California under Section 209 of the CAA to enforce more stringent

emission standards for motor vehicles than those required by EPA for the explicit purpose of GHG emission reduction, and indirectly, criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emission reduction. On March 31, 2020, Part Two of the SAFE Rule was published and would amend existing CAFE and tailpipe CO₂ emissions standards for passenger cars and light trucks and establish new standards covering model years 2021 through 2026.

GHG Reduction Regulations

Several regulatory measures such as AB 32 and the Climate Change Scoping Plan, EO B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197 were enacted to reduce GHGs and have the co-benefit of reducing California's dependency on fossil fuels and making land use development and transportation systems more energy efficient.

Renewable Energy Regulations

SB X1-2 of 2011 requires all California utilities to generate 33 percent of their electricity from renewables by 2020. SB X1-2 also requires the renewable electricity standard to be met increasingly with renewable energy that is supplied to the California grid from sources within, or directly proximate to, California. SB X1-2 mandates that renewables from these sources make up at least 50 percent of the total renewable energy for the 2011-2013 compliance period, at least 65 percent for the 2014-2016 compliance period, and at least 75 percent for 2016 and beyond.

SB 100, signed in September 2018, requires that all California utilities, including independently-owned utilities, energy service providers, and community choice aggregators, supply 44 percent of retail sales from renewable resources by December 31, 2024, 50 percent of all electricity sold by December 31, 2026, 52 percent by December 31, 2027, and 60 percent by December 31, 2030. The law also requires that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all State agencies by December 31, 2045.

Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is designed to improve vehicle fuel economy and help reduce U.S. dependence on oil. It represents a major step forward in expanding the production of renewable fuels, reducing dependence on oil, and confronting global climate change. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 increases the supply of alternative fuel sources by setting a mandatory Renewable Fuel Standard requiring fuel producers to use at least 36 billion gallons of biofuel in 2022, which represents a nearly five-fold increase over current levels; and reduces U.S. demand for oil by setting a national fuel economy standard of 35 miles per gallon by 2020—an increase in fuel economy standards of 40 percent.

By addressing renewable fuels and the CAFE standards, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 builds upon progress made by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 in setting out a comprehensive national energy strategy for the 21st century.

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

Structures built would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2035 General Plan includes policies (see 2035 General Plan Energy Resources Goal U 6.1.1) and related policies to encourage energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, coordination with local utility providers and recruitment of businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

The Master EIR discussed energy conservation and relevant General Plan policies in section 6.3 (page 6-3). The discussion concluded that with implementation of the General Plan policies and energy regulation (e.g., Title 24) development allowed in the General Plan would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

See also Section 12, below, discussing impacts related to energy. The Master EIR concluded that implementation of state regulation, coordination with energy providers and implementation of General Plan policies would reduce the potential impacts from construction of new energy production or transmission facilities to a less-than-significant level.

Sacramento Climate Action Plan

The Sacramento CAP was adopted on February 14, 2012 by the Sacramento City Council and was incorporated into the 2035 General Plan. The Sacramento CAP includes GHG emission reduction targets, strategies, and implementation measures developed to help the City reach these targets. Reduction strategies address GHG emissions associated with transportation and land use, energy, water, waste management and recycling, agriculture, and open space.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if the proposed Project would:

- result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during Project construction or operation; and/or
- conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Answers to Checklist Questions

- A) A) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

No additional significant environmental effect. Neither federal or State law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish thresholds that define when energy consumption is considered wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary. Compliance with CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. For example, energy would be required to transport people and goods to and from the Project site. Energy use is discussed by anticipated use type below.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the proposed Project would involve the consumption of energy in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel in order to power construction worker vehicle trips, hauling and materials delivery truck trips, and operation of construction equipment. In addition, portable generators may be used on-site in order to produce additional electricity for temporary on-site lighting, welding, and the supply of energy where hookups to the existing electricity grid are not readily available.

Due to the necessity for different stages of construction (e.g. site preparation, grading, and building construction), the operation of construction equipment would occur at different locations and at different times within the Project site. Additionally, the use of construction equipment is regulated under the CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. The In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation aims to reduce emissions from in-use off-road, heavy duty vehicles in California by imposing limits on idling, requiring all vehicles to be reported to CARB, restricting the addition of older vehicles to existing fleets, and requiring fleets to reduce emissions by replacing, retrofitting, or retiring older engines. The use of In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation would therefore assist in improving vehicle fuel efficiency and reducing GHG emissions.

The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, prepared by CARB, outlines examples of local actions that would support the State's climate goals, including municipal code changes, zoning changes, policy directions, and mitigation measures. The CARB Diesel Vehicle Regulation described above, with which the Project must comply, would maintain the Project's consistency with the intention and recommendations of the 2017 Scoping Plan.

Despite the temporary increase in energy use occurring during construction of the proposed Project, the Project would not result in a significant increase in peak or base demands or require additional capacity from local or regional energy facilities. In addition, construction would be subject to all applicable regulations related to energy conservation and fuel efficiency, which would serve to reduce the temporary increase in energy demand.

OPERATIONAL

The proposed Project would be required to comply with all the relevant provisions outlined in the most recent update of the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC), including the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Adherence to all applicable regulations included in the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) would ensure that the buildings resulting from this Project would consume energy efficiently through the incorporation of features such as insulated walls and high efficacy lighting. Mandatory compliance with the CBSC ensures that building energy use resulting from the completion of this Project would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Additionally, SMUD is required to comply with the State's Renewables Portfolio Standard, mandating that investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators must meet a 33 percent total procurement of eligible renewable energy resources by 2020 and 60 percent total procurement by 2030. This ensures that a portion of the electricity consumed during Project operations would be generated from renewable resources.

See Section 13, Transportation, for discussion surrounding transportation energy use and the VMT associated with the development of the proposed Project. Based on the above, construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Thus, implementation of the proposed Project would have no additional significant environmental effect related to energy beyond what was previously evaluated in the Master EIR.

B) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No additional significant environmental effect. Structures built as part of the Project would be subject to Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which serve to reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2030 General Plan includes policies (see Policies 6.1.10 through 6.1.13) to encourage the spread of energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, and recruiting businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency. Policies 6.1.6

through 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would reduce the cumulative impacts associated with use of non-renewable energy sources. In addition, Policies 6.1.5 and 6.1.12 call for the City to work with utility providers and industries to promote new conservation technologies.

The Master EIR evaluated the potential impacts on energy and concluded that the effects would be less than significant (See Impacts 6.11-9 and 6.11-10). The proposed Project would not result in any impacts not identified and evaluated in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None.

Findings

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Energy.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
5. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the Project allow a Project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the Project on such a site without protection against those hazards?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Geological formations of the Project vicinity include marine and nonmarine (continental) sedimentary rocks (Pleistocene-Holocene) - Alluvium, lake, playa, and terrace deposits; unconsolidated and semi consolidated (Q) (Geologic Map of California, 2022).

Surface faulting or ground rupture tends to occur along lines of previous faulting. The nearest fault is the Foothill Fault System, located approximately 30 miles north east of the Project area. Since previously identified fault lines are not within or near the Project area, the possibility of fault rupture is negligible within the site, but in the event of an earthquake on a nearby fault, the Project site could experience ground shaking. The California Geological Survey (CGS) probabilistic seismic hazards maps shows that the seismic ground-shaking hazard for the city is relatively low, and is among the lowest in the State.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if it allows a Project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the Project on such a site without protection against those hazards.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the City. Implementation of identified policies in the 2035 General Plan reduced all effects to a less-than-significant level. Policy EC 1.1.1 requires regular review of the City's seismic and geologic safety standards, and Policy EC 1.1.2 requires geotechnical investigations for Project sites to identify and respond to geologic hazards, when present.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Would the Project allow a Project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the Project on such a site without protection against those hazards?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project area is located approximately 30 miles northeast of the nearest active fault and is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, the chance of fault rupture within the Project area is very low. Since previously identified fault lines are not within or near the Project site, the possibility of fault rupture is negligible within the Project

site, but in the event of an earthquake on a nearby fault, the Project site could experience ground shaking.

General Plan Goal EC 1.1 and Policies 1.1.1 to 1.1.3 would ensure that lives and property within the Project area protected from seismic hazards. These policies include regular review and enforcement of seismic and geologic safety standards, and geotechnical investigations to determine potential for hazards such as ground rupture, ground shaking, and liquefaction due to seismic events, as well as expansive soils and subsidence problems on sites where these hazards may be present. This impact is within the scope of the General Plan and was analyzed in the Master EIR. The Project site is relatively level, so there would be no impacts related to the possibility of landslides.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Geology and Soils.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
6. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the Project:			
A) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X	
B) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X	

Environmental Setting

The City of Sacramento is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which is a valley bounded by the North Coast Mountain Ranges to the west and the Northern Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east. The terrain in the valley is flat and approximately 25 feet above sea level.

Hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters characterize the Mediterranean climate of the Sacramento Valley. Throughout the year, daily temperatures may range by 20 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs often exceeding 100 degrees and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches and snowfall is very rare. Summertime temperatures are normally moderated by the presence of the "Delta breeze" that arrives through the Carquinez Strait in the evening hours.

The mountains surrounding the SVAB create a barrier to airflow, which can trap air pollutants in the valley. The highest frequency of air stagnation occurs in the autumn and early winter when large high-pressure cells lie over the valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduces the influx of outside air and allows air pollutants to become concentrated in a stable volume of air. The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with temperature inversions that trap cooler air and pollutants near the ground.

The warmer months in the SVAB (May through October) are characterized by stagnant morning air or light winds, and the Delta breeze that arrives in the evening out of the southwest. Usually, the evening breeze transports a portion of airborne pollutants to the north and out of the Sacramento Valley. During about half of the day from July to September, however, a phenomenon called the "Schultz Eddy" prevents this from occurring. Instead of allowing the prevailing wind patterns to move north carrying the pollutants out of the valley, the Schultz Eddy causes the wind pattern to circle back south. This phenomenon exacerbates the pollution levels in the area and increases the likelihood of violating Federal or State standards. The Schultz Eddy normally dissipates around noon when the Delta breeze begins.

Greenhouse Gases

Certain gases in the earth's atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the earth's surface temperature. GHGs are responsible for "trapping" solar radiation in the earth's atmosphere, a phenomenon known as the greenhouse effect. Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a

trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable, in large part, to human activities associated with on-road and off-road transportation, industrial/manufacturing, electricity generation by utilities and consumption by end users, residential and commercial on-site fuel usage, and agriculture and forestry. Emissions of CO₂ are, largely, byproducts of fossil fuel combustion.

The quantity of GHGs in the atmosphere responsible for climate change is not precisely known, but it is enormous. No single Project alone would measurably contribute to an incremental change in the global average temperature or to global or local climates or microclimates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts relative to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

Several regulations currently exist related to GHG emissions, predominantly Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Executive Order S-3-05, and Senate Bill (SB) 32. AB 32 requires that Statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Executive Order S-3-05 established the GHG emission reduction target for the State to reduce to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020 (AB 32), 40 percent below the 1990 level by 2030, and to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050 (SB 32).

To meet the statewide GHG emission targets, the City adopted the City of Sacramento Climate Action Plan (CAP) on February 14, 2012 to comply with AB 32. The CAP identified how the City and the broader community could reduce Sacramento's GHG emissions and included reduction targets, strategies, and specific actions. In 2015, the City of Sacramento adopted the 2035 General Plan Update. The update incorporated measures and actions from the CAP into Appendix B, General Plan CAP Policies and Programs, which includes citywide policies and programs that are supportive of reducing GHG emissions

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A Project is considered to have a significant effect relating to greenhouse gas emissions if it fails to satisfy the requirements of the City's Climate Action Plan.
-

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR found that greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2035 General Plan would contribute to climate change on a cumulative basis. Policies of the General Plan identified in the Master EIR that would reduce construction related GHG emissions include: ER 6.1.2, ER 6.1.11 requiring coordination with SMAQMD to ensure feasible mitigation measures are incorporated to reduce GHG emissions, and ER 6.1.15. The 2035 General Plan incorporates the GHG reduction strategy of the 2012 Climate Action Plan (CAP), which demonstrates compliance mechanism for achieving the City's adopted GHG reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 emissions by 2020. Policy ER 6.1.8 commits the City to assess and monitor performance of GHG emission reduction efforts beyond 2020, and progress toward meeting long-term GHG emission reduction goals, ER 6.1.9 also commits the City to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of new GHG emissions reduction measures in view of the City's longer-term GHG emission reductions goal. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150)

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2035 General Plan that addressed greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 4.14, and pages 4.14-1 et seq. The Master EIR is available for review online at

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. Construction emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using CalEEMod version 2020.4. The modelling assumptions, inputs, and output file can be found in Appendix A. The results of the modelling show that construction of the proposed Project would result in 58.86 metric tons of CO₂e annually (322.5 pounds per day on average). This is below the SMAQMD GHG construction phase threshold for land development Projects (1,100 metric tons/year), which is used to attain improved air quality and reduce GHG's in the 2035 General Plan.

Per the SMAQMD thresholds, operational emissions for land development Projects need to demonstrate consistency with the City's CAP by implementing BMP's. Further discussion on the Project's consistency with the City's CAP is discussed below, however, the Project will implement measure AQ-2 to demonstrate compliance.

The proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment since construction emissions are below the SMAQMD GHG thresholds and operational emissions are consistent with the City's CAP- with implementation of measure AQ-2. The proposed Project would not result in any impacts not identified and evaluated in the Master EIR.

- B) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. To comply with AB 32 and meet the statewide GHG emission targets, the City adopted the City of Sacramento CAP on February 14, 2012. The CAP identified how the City and the broader community could reduce Sacramento's GHG emissions and included reduction targets, strategies, and specific actions. In 2015, the City adopted the 2035 General Plan Update. The update incorporated measures and actions from the CAP into Appendix B, General Plan CAP Policies and Programs, which includes citywide policies and programs that are supportive of reducing GHG emissions. Upon adoption of the 2035 General Plan, the 2012 CAP was rescinded, and the 2035 General Plan became the City's CAP. In updating the 2035 General Plan the City has met the State standards as a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions under Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. It should be noted that the City is currently undertaking an update to the City's General Plan, 2040 General Plan Update, as well as a standalone CAAP.

The Preliminary Draft CAAP, which was released for a 30-day early review on July 1, 2022, is a critical component of the larger Sacramento 2040 effort that involves a comprehensive update of the General Plan, the complete CAAP, and a Master EIR. The Preliminary Draft CAAP sets new and ambitious targets for the City and identifies key decarbonization strategies and implementable actions that form the foundation of Sacramento's goal for achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. By implementing measure AQ-2, per the SMAQMD thresholds of significance table, the Project is consistent with the Preliminary Draft CAAP. Additionally, the Project is within the Florin Road Corridor area and would support existing retail and employment opportunities in this area, this is consistent with measure E-5 which is used as a measure to reduce GHG in the Preliminary Draft CAAP (City of Sacramento, 2022).

With adherence to standard BMPs required with SMAQMD, as described in measures AQ-1 and AQ2, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing CAP policies and programs that intend to reduce emissions of GHGs.

MITIGATION MEASURES

See Section 2 – Air Quality for air quality specific measures.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

8. HAZARDS

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
8. HAZARDS Would the Project:			
A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?		X	
B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?			X
C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with these regulations respecting asbestos may result in a Notice of Violation being issued by the AQMD and civil penalties under state and/or federal law, in addition to possible action by U.S. EPA under federal law.

Federal law covers a number of different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (40 CFR § 61.145).

SMAQMD RULE 902 AND COMMERCIAL STRUCTURES

The work practices and administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to all commercial renovations and demolitions where the amount of Regulated Asbestos-Containing Material (RACM) is greater than:

- 260 lineal feet of RACM on pipes, or
- 160 square feet of RACM on other facility components, or
- 35 cubic feet of RACM that could not be measured otherwise.

The administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to any demolition of commercial structures, regardless of the amount of RACM. To determine the amount of RACM in a structure, Rule 902 requires that a survey be conducted prior to demolition or renovation unless:

- the structure is otherwise exempt from the rule, or
- any material that has a propensity to contain asbestos (so-called "suspect material") is treated as if it is RACM.

Surveys must be done by a licensed asbestos consultant and require laboratory analysis. Asbestos consultants are listed in the phone book under "Asbestos Consultants." Large industrial facilities may use non-licensed employees if those employees are trained by the U.S. EPA. Questions regarding the use of non-licensed employees should be directed to the AQMD.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if the proposed Project would:

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

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 4.6. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities, and exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the general plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2035 general Plan, including PHS 3.1.1 (investigation of sites for contamination) and PHS 3.1.2 (preparation of hazardous materials actions plans when appropriate) were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. The former gas station at the proposed Project site was the site of a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Cleanup. Previous station upgrades resulted in investigations conducted during 1999 which concluded that Petroleum Hydrocarbons were present. Remedial activities were performed and it was determined that the site was no longer contaminated. The case was closed as of March 2019. More information on this can be found in the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment performed for the proposed Project (Appendix E).

However unlikely, unknown hazardous waste/material could be encountered during Project construction. Therefore, the proposed Project could result in additional significant environmental effects related to hazardous waste/materials beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR. With the incorporation of HAZ-1 there would be a less-than-significant impact to people in regard to exposure of existing contaminated soil and lead during construction activities.

- B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?

No additional significant environmental effect. In February of 2020, the proposed Project site was surveyed for the presence of any asbestos or lead containing materials. Samples were analyzed using Polarized Light Microscopy (asbestos) and X-ray fluorescence (lead). Results from the analysis were negative for both contaminants. For more information, these reports can be found in Appendix A.

- C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project would not be expected to require any on-site dewatering activities. Construction activities would be limited to the proposed Project site. Groundwater would not be anticipated to be encountered during rehabilitation of the site, as the site is already graded. Thus, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to the

potential to expose construction workers and pedestrians to contaminated groundwater and implementation of the proposed Project would result in no additional significant environmental effects beyond what has been previously analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES**HAZ-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Hazardous Waste and Contamination**

- After unknown and potentially hazardous wastes and contamination, including underground tanks, are discovered, cease construction work in that area.
- Secure the area with barriers or fences and evacuate the vicinity.
- Prohibit construction personnel from any exploratory or investigative work that would result in further personal exposure.
- For any necessary exploratory, investigative, or cleanup work, use specialized consultants or safety workers who are fully trained, licensed, and qualified for hazardous waste work in accordance with state and federal regulations.
- No one enter the designated exclusion zones until a qualified professional has determined no exposure danger exists.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to Hazards can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project area is within the Valley-American hydrologic unit and the Lower Sacramento River Watershed. Creeks, streams, or rivers are not present on the Project site.

The Sacramento River and its tributary channels beneficial uses are municipal and domestic supply, agriculture, industry, recreation, freshwater habitats (migration and spawning of fish), and wildlife habitat according to the Basin Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1998).

The proposed Project is not located within one of California's four sole source aquifers. The Project is located in Sacramento County which does not have a sole source aquifer.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to hydrology and water quality may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan MEIR:

- substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan or
- substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.7 of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts 4.7-1, 4.7-2), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 4.7-3). Policies included in the 2035 General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation (Policies ER 1.1.2, EC 2.1.1), comprehensive flood management (Policy EC 2.1.23), and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Policy ER 1.1.1 to ER 1.1.10) were identified that the Master EIR concluded would reduce all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Project?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. There is potential for the proposed Project to result in degradation of water quality during both the construction and operational phases. Polluted runoff from the Project site during construction and operation could include sediment from soil disturbances, oil and grease from construction equipment and vehicles, and pesticides and fertilizers from landscaped areas. This degradation could result in violation of water quality standards.

The City's Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP) contains guidance for construction on small building sites (sites under 1 acre) to comply with the City's MS4 permit requirements. The following recommended BMPs will be implemented during construction: evaluate the site and protect natural features, schedule work to minimize problems, install perimeter controls, install stabilized construction access, protect storm drain inlets, use other pollution control practices as needed, maintain BMPs, and perform final steps (stabilize the site and remove all temporary construction BMPs). Conformance with City regulations and permit requirements along with implementation of BMPs would ensure that construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in a less-than significant impact related to water quality.

As a standard Condition of Approval for development Projects in the City, the City's Department of Utilities requires preparation and submittal of Project-specific drainage studies. With submittal of the required drainage study, the Department of Utilities would review to ensure that adequate water quality control facilities are incorporated prior to approving the Improvement Plans for the proposed Project. It should be noted that the proposed Project would comply with Section 13.08.145, Mitigation of drainage impacts; design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities, of the City of Sacramento Code.

Design of the proposed Project and conformance with City and state regulations would ensure that a substantial degradation to water quality or violation of any water quality objectives due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the proposed Project would not occur. The proposed Project would not result in a Project-specific impact related to the degradation of water quality during construction, the proposed Project would result in no additional significant environmental effects beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR. Implementation of measures WQ-1 would further minimize potential impacts to water quality.

- B) Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood?

No additional significant environmental effect. The Project is located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Zone X, area with reduced flood risk due to levee. As such, the proposed Project would not place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and no additional significant environmental effect would occur relative to flooding impacts analyzed in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

WQ-1: Water Quality BMPs will be incorporated into Project design and Project management to minimize impacts on the environment including erosion and the release of pollutants (e.g. oils, fuels):

- Exposed soils and material stockpiles would be stabilized, through watering or other measures, to prevent the movement of dust at the Project site caused by wind and construction activities such as traffic and grading activities;

- All construction roadway areas would be properly protected to prevent excess erosion, sedimentation, and water pollution;
- All vehicle and equipment fueling/maintenance would be conducted outside of any surface waters;
- Equipment used in and around jurisdictional waters must be in good working order and free of dripping or leaking contaminants;
- Raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life shall be prevented from contaminating the soil or entering jurisdictional waters;
- All erosion control measures and storm water control measures would be properly maintained until the site has returned to a pre-construction state;
- All disturbed areas would be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, either through hydroseeding or other means, with native or approved non-invasive exotic species;
- All construction materials would be hauled off-site after completion of construction

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to Hydrology and Water Quality can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

10. NOISE

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
10. <u>NOISE</u> Would the Project:			
A) Result in exterior noise levels in the Project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the Project's noise level increases?			X
B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater caused by noise level increases due to the Project?			X
C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento general plan or Noise Ordinance?			X
D) Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to Project construction?			X
E) Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations?			X
F) Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to Project construction and highway traffic?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Land uses in the Project vicinity consist of Suburban Center, Suburban Neighborhood High and Low Density, and Parks and Recreation. The noise environment near the Project is dominated by traffic on Rio Linda Boulevard. The nearest sensitive receptors are single family homes and apartments that are adjacent to the site to the east and south, respectively.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts due to noise may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of general plan policies:

- result in exterior noise levels in the Project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the Project's noise level increases;
- result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA L_{dn} or greater caused by noise level increases due to the Project;
- result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;

- permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to Project construction;
- permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to Project construction and highway traffic.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2035 General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior (Policy EC 3.1.1) and interior (Policy EC 3.1.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy EC 3.1.8, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 3.1.9, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 4.8-1) and interior noise levels (Impact 4.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 4.8-4) were found to be significant and unavoidable.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Result in exterior noise levels in the Project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the Project's noise level increases?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project would be constructed on a developed parcel designated for urban development within an existing urbanized area. Existing noise within the proposed Project site includes noise from the operations of the adjacent church and homes, and traffic associated with Rio Linda Boulevard. The proposed Project would not change the land use or substantially change the nature of the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, proposed Project operations would not increase exterior noise levels in the proposed Project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses.

- B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater caused by noise level increases due to the Project?

No additional significant environmental effect. As discussed above, the Project site is located in an urban area which contains existing commercial buildings and would not change the land use or substantially change the nature of the surrounding neighborhood. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the single-family homes and apartments located to the east and south of the site, respectively. Given the distance between the proposed Project site and the nearest sensitive receptor, and the current land use of the surrounding area, the proposed Project would not result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater. Thus, the proposed Project would have no additional significant environmental effect related to noise beyond what was previously evaluated in the Master EIR.

- C) Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento General Plan or Noise Ordinance?

No additional significant environmental effect. Noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the immediate area of construction. Based on CalEEMod and the Federal Transit Administration data (Appendix A), activities in typical construction would generate maximum noise levels up to 89 dB at a distance of 50 feet, however, since the site is already graded, the maximum noise levels would be up to 85 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced over distance at a rate of about 6 dB per doubling of distance. Additionally, construction operations that occur between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM, Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Sundays are exempt from noise standards under City Code Section 8.68.080. The

contractor would be required to conduct work in accordance with the times listed. Thus, the proposed Project would have no additional significant environmental effect related to noise beyond what was previously evaluated in the Master EIR.

- D) Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to Project construction?

No additional significant environmental effect. Construction of the proposed Project would not perceptibly increase groundborne vibration or groundborne noise since construction would not involve vibration creating activities such as pile driving.

- E) Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations?

No additional significant environmental effect. There are no new highway or railway operations associated with the construction of the proposed Project. The nearest highway is Highway 80 approximately 1.1 miles to the north, and the nearest railroad is approximately 1.5 miles to the southeast. There would be no impact.

- F) Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to Project construction and highway traffic?

No additional significant environmental effect. No historic buildings or archaeological sites have been identified within the proposed Project area. The buildings in the Project vicinity that would be impacted by construction are commercial and residential structures, none of which are considered extremely fragile, fragile, or historic buildings. Therefore, no historic buildings or archaeological sites would be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to Project construction and highway traffic. There would be no impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

Findings

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to Noise can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<u>11. PUBLIC SERVICES</u> Would the Project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Fire

The Sacramento Fire Department (SFD) provides fire protection services to the entire City and some small areas just outside the City boundaries within the County limits. Sacramento Fire Station 20 is the closest fire station to the Project site and is located at 2512 Rio Linda Boulevard, approximately 0.8 mile south of the proposed Project site.

Police

Police protection services are provided by the Sacramento Police Department (SPD) for areas within the City. The proposed Project site is within Police District 2 and the nearest police facility is located at 3550 Marysville Boulevard approximately 1.3 miles from the proposed Project site. In addition to the SPD and Sheriff's Department, the California Highway Patrol and the Regional Transit Police Department provide police protection within the City of Sacramento.

School District

The proposed Project site is within Sacramento City Unified School District. The proposed Project site is located approximately 0.6 miles from Martin Luther King Jr. Technology Academy. No detour to the school would be implemented due to the proposed Project.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the Project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on various public services. These include police, fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency services (Chapter 4.10).

The general plan provides that adequate staffing levels for police and fire are important for the long-term health, safety and well-being of the community (Goal PHS 1.1, PHS 2.1). The Master EIR concluded that effects of development that could occur under the general plan would be less than significant.

General plan policies that call for the City to consider impacts of new development on schools (see, for example, Policy ERC 1.1.2 setting forth locational criteria, and Policy ERC 1.1.4 that encourages joint-use development of facilities) reduce impacts on schools to a less-than-significant level. (Impacts 4.10-3, 4) Impacts on library facilities were considered less than significant (Impact 4.10-5).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Would the Project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project is consistent with 2035 General Plan land use designations and current zoning. The proposed Project would not provide additional housing to the area and would not result in an increase in population. The proposed Project would not require the need for public facilities or governmental service beyond what has been anticipated in the 2035 General Plan. The proposed Project would have no additional significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Public Services.

12. RECREATION

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
11. RECREATION Would the Project:			
A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?			X
B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City Department of Youth, Parks and Community Enrichment maintains all parks and recreational facilities within the City. As noted in the City's General Plan Background Report, the City currently contains 230 developed and undeveloped park sites, 88 miles of off-street bikeways and trails, 21 lakes/ponds or beaches, over 20 aquatic facilities, and extensive recreation facilities in the City parks. The developed park sites comprise 218 total parks with an area of 4,829 acres of parkland.

Residential and non-residential Projects that are built in the City are required to pay a park development impact fee per Chapter 18.56 of the Sacramento City Code. The fees collected pursuant to Chapter 18.56 are primarily used to finance the construction of neighborhood and community park facilities.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to recreational resources are considered significant if the proposed Project would do either of the following:

- cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities; or
- create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 4.9 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2035 General Plan on the City's existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities and recreational services. The general plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal ERC 2.1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities (Policy ERC 2.2.5). Employees are expected to use park facilities at a lesser rate than residents. Within the Central City, workers are expected to use Neighborhood parks about 5 percent as much as local residents and are expected to use Community and Citywide parks and facilities about 20 percent as much as local residents. Within the Remaining City, workers are not expected to use Neighborhood parks (which are typically designed to serve local residents only), but are expected to use Community and Citywide parks and facilities about 20 percent as much as local residents (PIF Nexus Study 2017). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies. (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2)

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project would not increase the City's population and does not include a residential development therefore, the Project would not burden any parks in the surrounding area beyond capacity by generating additional recreational users. As such, the proposed Project would not increase the use of park and recreational facilities resulting in substantial physical deterioration of the facility. The proposed Project would result in no additional significant environmental effects beyond the effects analyzed in the Master EIR.

- B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project would not include residential development or increase population; therefore, the Project would not create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Recreation.

13. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
13. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION Would the Project:			
A) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			X
B) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X
C) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
D) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Rio Linda Boulevard is a north-south major collector bordering the western edge of the proposed Project site. Rio Linda Boulevard connects the residential areas surrounding the site with Highway 80. Highway 80 is an east-west freeway located north of the proposed Project site, with ramps located approximately 1.5 miles from the site.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 4.12. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and aviation components. Provisions of the 2035 General Plan that provide substantial guidance include Mobility Goal 1.1, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated and maintained, promotion of multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1), support for state highway expansion and management consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SACOG MTP/SCS) (Policy M 1.5.6) and development that encourages walking and biking (Policy LU 4.2.1).

While the general plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, the Master EIR concluded that the general plan development would result in significant and unavoidable effects. See Impacts 4.12-3 (roadway segments in adjacent communities, and Impact 4.12-4 (freeway segments).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project does not include any uses that would potentially conflict with an existing City program, ordinance, or policy that addresses circulation. The proposed Project is located along Rio Linda Boulevard, which currently contains bicycle lanes and sidewalks. Existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be maintained.

- B) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No additional significant environmental effect. In December 2018, OPR published technical guidance recommending approaches to analyzing transportation and land use Projects. Since new retail development often redistributes trips rather than creating new travel demand, the OPR guidance recommends that lead agencies analyze the net change in VMT to indicate the transportation impact of retail Projects. The potential for VMT impacts, according to this approach, hinges on whether the Project can be considered local-serving or regional. By adding retail opportunities within existing neighborhoods, local serving retail Projects can shorten trips and reduce overall VMT. In contrast, regional destination retail Projects would draw customers from larger trade areas, potentially substituting for shorter trips and increasing VMT. The OPR guidance suggests that any retail Projects, including stores larger than 50,000 sf, might be considered as regional serving retail and therefore require an analysis of net change in VMT. As this Project is composed of a retail store totaling less than 50,000 sf, consistent with OPR Guidelines, it was determined that a quantitative analysis was not necessary. The Project would not Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

- C) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project would be built within the site of a former gas station. The Project has been designed to ensure existing ingress and egress and existing sight distances. The proposed Project does not include any unusual features design features or introduce incompatible users that could create a potentially hazardous situation.

- D) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No additional significant environmental effect. Access to the Project site would be provided via Florin Road and Franklin Boulevard, which would provide adequate emergency access during construction and upon completion of the Project.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Transportation and Circulation.

14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the Project:			
A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is:		X	
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources code section 5020.1(k) or			
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X	

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Please reference the Cultural Resources Chapter for the Ethnohistory of the historic indigenous groups that occupied the region. This section focuses on the contemporary tribal communities and tribal cultural resources as they pertain to AB52.

This section analyzes and evaluates the potential impacts of the project on Tribal cultural resources, both identified and undiscovered. Tribal cultural resources, as defined by Assembly Bill (AB) 52, Statutes of 2014, in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074, are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects, with cultural value to a Tribe. A Tribal cultural landscape is defined as a geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.

The unanticipated find of Native American human remains would also be considered a Tribal cultural resource, and are therefore analyzed in this section. The proposed project area is situated within the lands traditionally occupied by the Valley Nisenan, or Southern Maidu. Many descendants of Valley Nisenan throughout the larger Sacramento region belong to the United Auburn Indian Community, Shingle Springs, Lone Band, Colfax-Todds Valley, and Wilton Rancheria Tribes. The Tribes actively participate in the identification, evaluation, preservation, and restoration of Tribal Cultural Resources.

DATA SOURCES/METHODOLOGY

Under PRC section 21080.3.1 and 21082.3, the City must consult with tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project area that have requested formal notification and responded with a request for consultation. The parties must consult in good faith. Consultation is deemed concluded when the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource when one is present or when a party concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. Mitigation measures agreed on during the consultation process must be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document.

In response to the City's notification of the Project to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC), UAIC conducted a records search for the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources for this Project which included a review of pertinent literature and historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the California Historic Resources Information System Center (CHRIS) as well as historic resources and survey data.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

On December 6, 2021 notifications were sent to the four tribes who've previously requested to receive notifications pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB 52).

Native American Consultation

On May 31, 2022, formal invitations to participate in Assembly Bill (AB52) consultation on the proposed project were sent by the City to the tribal representation that have previously requested to receive notifications of proposed projects pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB52). These tribes represented include:

- United Auburn Indian Community
- Wilton Rancheria
- Shingle Springs Band of Mi-Wok Indians
- Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians

The United Auburn Indian Community provided a response to AB52 consultation on May 31, 2022, and closed consultation on June 28, 2022, ultimately declining to consult on the project with the inclusion of the unanticipated discoveries mitigation measure. No response was received from Wilton Rancheria, the Shingle Springs Band of Mi-Wok Indians, or the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians within 30 calendar days of the request for formal invitation under AB52.

Regulatory Setting**FEDERAL**

There are no Federal plans, policies, or regulations related to Tribal Cultural Resources that are directly applicable to the proposed Project, however Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does require consultation with Native Americans to identify and consider certain types of cultural resources. Cultural resources of Native American origin identified as a result of the identification efforts conducted under Section 106 may also qualify as tribal cultural resources under CEQA.

STATE

California Environmental Quality Act — Statute and Guidelines. CEQA requires that public agencies that finance or approve public or private Projects must assess the effects of the Project on tribal cultural resources. Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is (1) listed or determined eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or a local register, or (2) that are determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

California Public Resources Code Section 5024. PRC Section 5024.1 establishes the CRHR, which is the authoritative guide for identifying the State's historical resources to indicate what properties are to be protected, if feasible, from substantial adverse change. For a resource to be eligible for the CRHR, it must be more than 50 years old, retain its historic integrity, and satisfy one or more of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, a tribal cultural resource is considered to be a significant resource if the resource is: 1) listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources; or 2) the resource has been determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts on tribal cultural resources may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed Project would result in the following:

- cause a substantial change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources (see Master EIR Chapter 4.4 and Appendix D – Background Report, B. Cultural Resources Appendix), but did not specifically address tribal cultural resources because that resource type had not yet been defined in CEQA at the time the Master EIR was adopted. The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historic resources and archaeological resources, some of which could be tribal cultural resources as defined Public Resources Code 21074. Ground-disturbing activities resulting from implementation of development under the 2035 General Plan could affect the integrity of an archaeological site (which may be a tribal cultural resource), thereby causing a substantial change in the significance of the resource. General plan policies identified as reducing such effects on cultural resources that may also be tribal cultural resources include identification of resources on Project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1); implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2); consultation with appropriate organizations and individuals including the Native American Heritage Commission and implementation of their consultation guidelines (Policy HCR 2.1.3); enforcement programs to promote the maintenance, rehabilitation, preservation, and interpretation of the City's historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.4); listing of qualified historic resources under appropriate national, State, and local registers (Policy HCR 2.1.5); consideration of historic and cultural resources in planning studies

(Policy HCR 2.1.6); enforcement of compliance with local, State, and federal historic and cultural preservation requirements (Policy HCR 2.1.8); and early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10).

Of particular relevance to this Project are policies that ensure compliance with protocol that protect or mitigate impacts to archaeological resources (Policy HCR 2.1.16) and that encourage preservation and minimization of impacts on cultural resources (Policy HCR 2.1.17).

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS –

- A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is:
- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources code section 5020.1(k)
 - ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. As described in Section 4 – Cultural Resources, the existing record searches did not identify known archaeological resources that could be considered tribal cultural resources, listed or determined eligible for listing in the California Register, or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k), pursuant to PRC Section 21074(a)(1) in the Project site.

As described above, according to the provision of PRC Section 21080.3, four Native American tribes have requested to receive notification of Projects in the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento. One tribe responded, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) responded to the formal notification for AB52 consultation and declined consultation on June 28, 2023. No other tribe responded within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification and requested consultation on this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES

TCR-1b: In the Event that Tribal Cultural Resources Are Discovered During Construction, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Avoid Significant Impacts and Procedures to Evaluate Resources.

If tribal cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project's City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- Planning construction to avoid tribal cultural resources, archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.

- Recommendations for avoidance of tribal cultural resources will be reviewed by the City representative, interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid tribal cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource or tribal cultural resource. • Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes will be notified to review and comment on these analyses and shall have the opportunity to meet with the City representative and its representatives who have technical expertise to identify and recommend feasible avoidance and design alternatives, so that appropriate and feasible avoidance and design alternatives can be identified.

- If the discovered tribal cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. The boundary of a tribal cultural resource will be determined in consultation with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and tribes will be notified to monitor the installation of fencing. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.

- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area”.

If a tribal cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of tribal cultural resources:

- Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources- (CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.

If a tribal cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City and with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that respond to the City’s notification. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall consult with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record. For any recommendations made by interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that are not implemented, a justification for why the recommendation was not followed will be provided in the project record.

Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American Tribes and the City representative will also consult to develop measures for long-term management of any discovered tribal cultural resources. Consultation will be limited to actions consistent with the jurisdiction of the City and taking into account ownership of the subject property.

subject property. To the extent that the City has jurisdiction, routine operation and maintenance within tribal cultural resources retaining tribal cultural integrity shall be consistent with the avoidance and minimization standards identified in this mitigation measure.

If the City determines that the project may cause a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to the resource. These measures may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less-than significant may be reached:

- Avoid and preserve resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
- Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Protect the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
 - Protect the traditional use of the resource.
 - Protect the confidentiality of the resource.
- Establish permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places.
- Protect the resource.

TCR-1c: Implement Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during project-related construction activities or project planning, the City the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner's findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of

THE REMAINS. THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CITY FOR ACTING UPON NOTIFICATION OF A DISCOVERY OF NATIVE AMERICAN HUMAN REMAINS ARE IDENTIFIED IN CALIFORNIA PRC SECTION 5097.9 ET SEQ.

If an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during Project-related construction activities or Project planning, the City the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner's findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains. The responsibilities of the City for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

Findings

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts related to Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

15. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
15. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the Project:			
A) Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the Project's demand in addition to existing commitments?			X
B) Require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			X

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Wastewater collection and treatment services for the proposed Project would be provided by the City of Sacramento (City). Wastewater generated from the Project area is collected in the City system through a series of sewer pipes and pump stations. Once collected in the City system, sewage flows into the SRCSD interceptor system, where the sewage is conveyed to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWWTP) located near Elk Grove. The City's Department of Utilities is responsible for providing and maintaining water, sewer collection, storm drainage, and flood control services for residents and businesses within city limits.

Water service for the proposed Project would be provided by the City. The City uses surface water from the Sacramento and American rivers to meet the majority of its water demands. To meet the City's water demand, the City uses surface water from the Sacramento and American rivers, and groundwater pumped from the North American and South American Subbasins.

The City does not provide commercial solid waste collection services. Rather, commercial garbage, recycling or yard waste services are provided by a franchised hauler authorized by the Sacramento Solid Waste Authority to collect commercial garbage and commingled recycling within the City. Kiefer Landfill, located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard in Sloughhouse, California, is the primary location for the disposal of waste by the City. According to the Master EIR, the landfill is permitted to accept up to 10,815 tons per day and the current peak and average daily disposal is much lower than the permitted amount. The landfill is anticipated to be capable of adequately serving the area, including the anticipated population growth, until the year 2065. Solid waste collected at commercial uses in the Project area is currently disposed of at the Kiefer Landfill.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the Project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, or school facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan:

- result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the Project's demand in addition to existing commitments or
- require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Master EIR evaluated the effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on water supply, sewer and storm drainage, solid waste, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications. See Chapter 4.11.

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2035 General Plan. Policies in the general plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 4.11-1) but the Master EIR concluded that the potential increase in demand for potable water in excess of the City's existing diversion and treatment capacity, and which could require construction of new water supply facilities, would result in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 4.11-2). The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a less-than-significant effect (Impact 4.11-4). Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant (Impact 4.11-5). Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less-than-significant level.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

- A) Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments?

No additional significant environmental effect. The Project site includes existing on-site structures. Thus, all urban utilities and services are available to the Project site.

The City of Sacramento is responsible for sewer collection in the proposed Project area. The City of Sacramento has anticipated the need for wastewater services in the Project area and requires development impact fees to support buildout demand of their service area (including the proposed Project site). City of Sacramento's pipelines eventually flow to the City of Sacramento, where wastewater is treated. The City of Sacramento would be able to provide sufficient wastewater services and conveyance to serve full buildout of the City, including the Project area, per the 2035 Master EIR. Therefore, adequate capacity exists to serve the wastewater demand associated with buildout of the proposed Project site with commercial uses.

The City is responsible for providing and maintaining water for the proposed Project site. The Urban Water Management Plan analyzes the water supply, water demand, and water shortage contingency planning for the City's service area, which would include the proposed Project site. According to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), under all drought conditions, the City possesses sufficient water supply entitlements to meet the demands of the City's customers up to the year 2035. Development of the proposed Project would increase water demand associated with the Project site. However, the proposed Project would be consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use and zoning designations. Therefore, such increases in water demand are within the capacities anticipated within the City's UWMP and analyzed in the Master EIR.

Solid waste from existing development in the proposed Project area is transferred to Kiefer Landfill for disposal. The 2035 General Plan Master EIR concluded that adequate capacity at local landfills exists for full buildout of the general plan. The proposed Project is consistent with what is anticipated for the site, and the associated increase in solid waste disposal needs was considered in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR analysis. The gas station and retail building would not generate an increase in solid waste from what has been anticipated in the Master EIR. As such, adequate capacity would be expected to be available to serve the proposed Project's solid waste disposal needs.

- B) Require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?

No additional significant environmental effect. Because adequate capacity exists to serve the proposed Project's demands in addition to existing commitments, no construction of new utilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in no additional environmental effects beyond what was analyzed in the 2035 Master EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Utilities and Service Systems.

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
A) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X	
B) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects.)			X
C) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X	

Answers to Checklist Questions

- 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?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. After a careful comparison between habitat requirements and the habitat available within the proposed Project area, no special status species were determined to have the potential to occur within the Project area. As such, the Project is not anticipated to result in the substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, or reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species.

The proposed Project does have the potential to impact previously undiscovered cultural and tribal cultural resources and/or human remains. With implementation of measures CR-1, CR-2, TCR-1a, and TCR-1b, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this IS, compliance with City 2035 General Plan policies, and application of standard BMPs during construction, development of the proposed Project would not result in any of the following: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce or impact the habitat of fish or wildlife species; 3) cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed Project's impact would be mitigated to

a less than significant level.

- B) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects.)

No additional significant environmental effect. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan and the findings in the Master EIR and would not result in individually limited but collectively significant impacts. Therefore, the Project would not cause any additional environmental effects.

- C) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant. The Project would not result in either direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings. Air quality, water quality, hazards, and noise can be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the mitigation measures included in this study (AQ-1, AQ-2, HAZ-1, WQ-1, and NOI-1).

SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this Project.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION V - DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial study:

Note: The applicable paragraph should be included, and the others deleted. Questions regarding the findings should be directed to the environmental Project planner.

I find that (a) the proposed Project is an anticipated subsequent Project identified and described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR; (b) the proposed Project is consistent with the 2035 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the Project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed Project; and (d) the proposed Project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the Project as appropriate, and additional feasible mitigation measures and alternatives will be incorporated to revise the proposed Project before the negative declaration is circulated for public review, to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b))

Signature

August 29, 2023

Date

Ron Bess
Printed Name

REFERENCES CITED

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2022: CalEEMod version 2020.4

California Department of Conservation, 2022: Geologic Map of California

City of Sacramento, 2015: 2035 General Plan.

City of Sacramento, 2015: Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report

City of Sacramento, 2022: Preliminary Climate Action and Adaptation Plan

City of Sacramento, 2022: Sacramento City Code

NRCS, 2023: Web Soil Survey

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 2020: SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table