City of SACRAMENTO
Community Development

300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Help Line: 916-264-5011
CityofSacramento.org/dsd

DATE: February 26, 2019

SUBJECT: **DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 20194.5 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15183.3 RE: INFILL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

PROJECT: Arden Gateway (DR18-209)

The City of Sacramento, Department of Community Development, Environmental Planning Services has determined, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 20194.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.3, and on the basis of the review and discussion in the Infill Environmental Checklist that the proposed infill project would not have any significant effects on the environment that have not already been analyzed in the Master EIR prepared for the City's 2035 General Plan or that are more significant than previously analyzed, or that uniformly applicable development policies would not substantially mitigate. No further CEQA review is required.

A copy of the Infill Environmental Checklist is attached to this Determination. The Master EIR and Infill Environmental Checklist for the project are available for review online on the City's web site at http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.
The documents are also available for review at the offices of the Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Sacramento, California during public counter hours.

The proposed project entails the construction and operation of up to 731 multifamily apartment units on approximately 24.29 acres in the Arden Gateway area of the City of Sacramento, roughly north of Arden Way between Interstate 80 Business (Business 80) and the Arden Fair Mall. Offsite improvements would be limited to connecting to nearby water, stormwater, and electric utilities, with all other development occurring within the footprint of the project site. A detailed project description is included in Section III of this document.

Attachment: Infill Environmental Checklist

ARDEN GATEWAY (DR18-209)

INFILL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This Infill Environmental Checklist has been prepared by the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21094.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), and implementing regulations in CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations), sections 15183.3 and Appendices M and N, and the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

ORGANIZATION OF THE INFILL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This Infill Environmental Checklist is organized into the following sections:

SECTION I – BACKGROUND: Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, and the date this Infill Environmental Checklist was completed.

SECTION II – SATISFACTION OF APPENDIX M PERFORMANCE STANDARDS: Includes description of project conformance to State CEQA Guidelines Appendix M standards and project eligibility for infill streamlining.

SECTION III – PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes a detailed description of the proposed project.

SECTION IV – INFILL 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 another EIR.

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

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

PURPOSE OF THE INFILL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Public Resources Code section 21094.5 (Senate Bill 226), along with its implementing regulations (Section 15183.3 and Appendices M and N of the CEQA Guidelines) (Infill Streamlining provisions) provide a streamlined CEQA process for projects that qualify as infill development.

In order to qualify for coverage under the Infill Streamlining provisions, a project site must either be in an urban area that has been previously developed, or the project site must have qualifying urban development, defined as one or a combination of residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, or retail use on at least 75 percent of the site perimeter.

The CEQA Guidelines, in Appendix M, include a set of performance standards, as required by SB 226, which a qualifying project must satisfy in order to be eligible for the Infill Streamlining process.

If a project meets the Appendix M performance standards, the lead agency may prepare an environmental checklist based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix N. The Appendix N Infill Environmental Checklist provides a tool to evaluate a development project and provide substantial evidence of its eligibility to use the infill streamlining process. The Infill Environmental Checklist also assists the lead agency in identifying and summarizing project-specific effects and how those effects are or are not addressed in a prior programmatic level document, or by uniformly applicable development policies:

> Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur as a result of an infill project, then the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact has already been analyzed in a prior EIR. If the effect of the infill project is not more significant than what has already been analyzed, that effect of the infill project is not subject to CEQA. The brief explanation accompanying this determination should include page and section references to the portions of the prior EIR containing the analysis of that effect. The brief explanation shall also indicate whether the prior EIR included any mitigation measures to substantially lessen that effect and whether those measures have been incorporated into the infill project.

For purposes of this Environmental Checklist, “uniformly applicable development policies or standards” include policies and standards adopted or enacted by the City of Sacramento or State of California that reduce one or more adverse environmental impacts. Such policies and standards can include, without limitation, local and state building codes, design guidelines, impact fee programs, traffic impact fees, policies for the reduction of greenhouse gasses contained in adopted land use plans, policies or regulations and ordinances for the protection of trees or historic resources (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3 (f)(7)). This checklist identifies uniformly applicable development standards, such as measures set forth in the City Code or general plan, to substantially mitigate effects of the proposed project. All general plan policies identified

herein as applicable to the proposed project would be implemented through project design or conditions of approval.

The City, as CEQA lead agency for the proposed project, has determined, based on substantial evidence contained in the documents and records regarding the proposed project, that the proposed project is eligible for infill streamlining pursuant to Public Resources Section 21094.5. This Environmental Checklist confirms that the proposed project qualifies for infill streamlining and provides documentation showing that the impacts of the proposed project fall within the impacts evaluated in prior EIRs, in this case, the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by uniformly applicable development policies or standards.

Section I - Background

1.	**Project Title:**	Arden Gateway
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:**	City of Sacramento
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:**	Tom Buford Community Development Department City of Sacramento 300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 808-7931 tbuford@cityofsacramento.org
4.	**Project Location:**	1401 Arden Way, 2160 and 2211 Royal Road, and 1600 Cormorant Way Sacramento, California, 95815
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	SKK Developments / Grupe Company 1121 18th Street Sacramento, California 95811
6.	**General Plan Designation(s):**	Urban Center High
7.	**Zoning:**	C-2 General Commercial

8. Prior environmental document(s) analyzing the effects of the infill project (including State Clearinghouse number if assigned):

2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2012122006)

9. Location of prior environmental document(s) analyzing the effects of the infill project:

The 2035 General Plan Master EIR is available on the City of Sacramento website: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports

10. Description of Project:

The proposed project entails the construction and operation of up to 731 multifamily apartment units on approximately 24.29 acres in the Arden Gateway area of the City of Sacramento, roughly north of Arden Way between Interstate 80 Business (Business 80) and the Arden Fair Mall. Offsite improvements would be limited to connecting to nearby water, stormwater, and electric utilities, with all other development occurring within the footprint of the project site. A detailed project description is included in Section III of this document.

11. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Adjacent uses to the project site include Sacramento Inn Way and Business 80 to the west, multifamily residential to the north and east, the Arden Fair Mall to the southeast, and Arden Way to the south.

12. Other public agencies whose approval is required

- Approval of a construction activity stormwater permit, including a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is required from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)

Section II - Satisfaction of Appendix M Performance Standards

This section provides information demonstrating that the proposed infill project satisfies the performance standards in Appendix M of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387).

1. **Does the non-residential infill project include a renewable energy feature? If so, describe below. If not, explain below why it is not feasible to do so.**

   The proposed project is a residential infill project.

2. **If the project site is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, either provide documentation of remediation or describe the recommendations provided in a preliminary endangerment assessment or comparable document that will be implemented as part of the project.**

   The project site is not included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

3. **If the infill project includes residential units located within 500 feet, or such distance that the local agency or local air district has determined is appropriate based on local conditions, a high volume roadway or other significant source of air pollution, as defined in Appendix M, describe the measures that the project will implement to protect public health. Such measures may include policies and standards identified in the local general plan, specific plans, zoning code or community risk reduction plan, or measures recommended in a health risk assessment, to promote the protection of public health. Identify the policies or standards, or refer the site specific analysis, below.**

   The proposed infill project includes residential units that would be located within 500 feet of a high volume roadway (Business 80) as defined in Appendix M. Project design would include design features that would result in compliance with local policy direction to reduce exposure to air emissions.

4. **For residential projects, the project satisfies which of the following?**

   ☐ **Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)**

   ☒ **Located within ½-mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor.**

   The project is located within 0.5 mile of the Arden Fair Transit Center, which is the confluence of Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) routes 22, 23, 29, 67, and 68. The Arden Fair Transit Center includes bus service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.[1] See Figure 2 in Section III, Project Description, showing the location of the Arden Fair Transit Center relative to the project site.

[1] Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT), 2018. Bus & Light Rail System Map. Effective April 1, 2018. Available: http://www.sacrt.com/systemmap/. Accessed February 23, 2019.

- ☐ **Consists of 300 or fewer units that are each affordable to low income households. (Attach evidence of legal commitment to ensure the continued availability and use of the housing units for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code, for a period of at least 30 years, at monthly housing costs, as determined pursuant to Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code.)**

5. **For commercial projects with a single building floor-plate below 50,000 square feet, the project satisfies which of the following?**

   - ☐ **Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)**
   - ☐ **The project is within one-half mile of 1800 dwelling units. (Attach map illustrating proximity to households.)**

   The proposed infill project is not a commercial project

6. **For office building projects, the project satisfies which of the following?**

   - ☐ **Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)**
   - ☐ **Located within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or within ¼ mile of a stop along a high quality transit corridor. (Attach map illustrating proximity to transit.)**

   The proposed infill project is not an office building project.

7. **For school projects, the project does all of the following:** (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)

   - ☐ **The project complies with the requirements of Sections 17213, 17213.1 and 17213.2 of the California Education Code.**
   - ☐ **The project is an elementary school and is within one mile of 50% of the student population, or is a middle school or high school and is within two miles of 50% of the student population. Alternatively, the school is within ½ miles of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor. (Attach map and methodology.)**
   - ☐ **The project provides parking and storage for bicycles and scooters.**

   The proposed infill project is not a school project.

8. **For small walkable community projects, the project must be a residential project that has a density of at least eight units to the acre or a commercial project with a floor area ratio of at least 0.5, or both.**

   The proposed infill project is not proposed as a small walkable community, and would not meet the criteria to be considered a small walkable community project because it is located within the boundary of a metropolitan planning organization.

Section III – Project Description

Introduction

SKK Developments/Grupe Company (project applicant) proposes to develop the Arden Gateway project (proposed project). The proposed development would include 731 multi-family apartment units, situated into two standalone multifamily apartment communities, on approximately 25 acres, including the former site of Red Lion Sacramento Inn, in the Arden area of the City of Sacramento, in the Swanston Estates neighborhood.

Project Location

Regionally located approximately 80 miles east of San Francisco and 85 miles west of Lake Tahoe, Sacramento is a major transportation hub. The City is a point of intersection of transportation routes that connect to the San Francisco Bay area to the west, the Sierra Nevada mountains and Nevada to the east, Los Angeles to the south, and Oregon and the Pacific Northwest to the north. The City is bisected by major freeways, including Interstate 5 (I-5) that traverses the state from north to south; Interstate 80 (I-80), which provides an east-west connection between San Francisco and Reno; and U.S. Highway 50 which provides an east-west connection between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe. Two railroads, the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and the BNSF Railway transect Sacramento. **Figure 1** shows the location of the project site in the Sacramento region.

The project site is located in the Arden area of the City, in the Swanston Estates neighborhood, generally southeast of Business 80, north of the Arden Fair Mall, and east of Ethan Way. The project site includes Assessor's Parcen Numbers (APNs) 277-0160-002, 277-0160-003, 277-0261-039, 277-0261-031, 277-0261-011, 277-0160-040, 277-0160-021, 277-0160-033, 277-0160-073, 277-0160-074, and 277-0261-040. The project site is approximately 25 acres of land that was previously used for commercial use as a hotel and conference center, bounded by Sacramento Inn Way to the west, Cormorant Way to the north, multi-family apartment development and Royale Road to the east, and the west end of the Arden Fair Mall parking lot and Arden Way to the south. **Figure 2** and **Figure 3** show the project vicinity and project site, respectively.

General Plan and Zoning

The project site is designated as Urban Center High in the City's 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram which is intended to provide thriving areas with concentrations of uses similar to downtown. As described in the Sacramento 2035 General Plan Land Use Element, each center includes employment-intensive uses, high-density housing, and a wide variety of retail uses including large-format retail, local shops, restaurants, and services. These areas include major transportation hubs accessible by public transit, major highways, and local arterials, and pedestrian travel. Building heights within the Urban Center High designation can range from two to twenty-four stories. Allowable uses within this land use designation generally include retail, service, office, residential uses, gathering places such as plazas, courtyards, parks, compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses. Development standards for the Urban Center High land use designation include minimum and maximum densities of 24.0 and 250 units-per-net-acre, respectively and minimum and maximum allowable floor area ratios (FARs) of 0.5 and 8.0.

Figure 1 Regional Location

Figure 2 Project Vicinity

Figure 3 Project Site

The project site is within the C-2 General Commercial zone. The purpose of the C-2 zone is to provide for the sale of goods, the performance of services, office uses, dwellings, small wholesale stores or distributors, and limited processing and packaging. The C-2 zone allows for a variety of residential, commercial, and institutional primary uses. As it pertains to the proposed residential project, allowable residential uses include dormitory and duplex, multi-dwelling-unit, and single-dwelling-unit uses. Multi-unit dwelling uses are subject to special use regulations, as defined in City Code 17.228.117, which provide guidance for the required management of multi-unit dwellings. C-2 zones generally have a maximum allowable height of 65 feet, unless within 80 feet of residential zones, for which transitional height requirements limit maximum allowable height further. The project site is not within 85 feet of a residential zone.

Existing and Adjacent Uses

The project site is currently vacant with remaining foundational elements and paving from the previously demolished hotel and associated structures. Adjacent uses to the project site include multi-family residential uses to the north and east, the Arden Fair Mall to the east, Business 80 to the west, and Arden Way and hotel uses to the south.

Project Design

Residential Structures

The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include up to 731 multi-family apartment units and associated amenities available for use by apartment residents, including 2 community centers, 2 pools, 1 pool support structure, 2 standalone trash enclosures, open space areas, internal roadways, private drives, covered and uncovered parking areas, and a stormwater retention area south of Royale Avenue, as shown in **Figure 4**. The project would be constructed in two phases, each phase developing a standalone apartment community, which would include a community center, pool area, open space, and internal gate-controlled driveways and parking areas. Access to each site would be gated for both vehicles and pedestrians. The two standalone apartment communities would be divided by an east/west internal spine roadway, which would provide access to and from adjacent roadways from the main entry and exit points for both apartment communities.

Five types of multi-family residential units are proposed, including 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom apartment units, studio units, and 3-bedroom townhome units. Overall, the average unit size would be approximately 890 – 898 square feet. The distribution of unit types is shown in **Table 1**, below. The proposed apartment structures would be 3-story structures with various shapes and numbers of apartment units. There would be 21 total apartment buildings. **Figures 5a and 5b** show examples of building elevations for the proposed apartment buildings. The apartment buildings would be the tallest structures on the project site reaching a maximum height of approximately 34 feet above ground level (see Figures 5a and 5b).

Figure 4 Site Plan

Figure 5a Apartment Building Elevations

Figure 5b Apartment Building Elevations

TABLE 1
UNIT MIX

Unit Type	Number of Units	Unit Square Feet	Percent of Total Units
Studio	36	544 SF	4.9%
1 Bedroom	343	689 - 798 SF	46.9%
2 Bedroom	289	998 – 1,196 SF	39.5%
3 Bedroom	36	1,297 SF	4.9%
Townhome	27	1,642 – 1,765 SF	3.7%
Total	**731**	**653,549 SF**	**100.0%**
Average		**890.61 – 898.32 SF**	

SOURCE: ARK Architects, January 2019.

As described above, the project site would be bisected by an internal spine roadway, running from Sacramento Inn Way to the Arden Fair Mall parking area, which would divide the two development phases of the proposed project. Phase I would develop 12.91 acres on the north east side of the project site, to the northeast of the internal project roadway. Phase II would develop the remaining 11.38 acres on the southwest side of the project site, to the southeast of the project roadway.

Phase I would develop 13 of the 21 proposed apartment buildings, constructing a total of 405 units, the internal project roadway, a community building and pool area, internal circulation driveways and parking areas, and open space areas. The Phase I development would be a standalone gated apartment community with all resident amenities being located within the Phase I site.

Phase II would develop the remaining 8 apartment/townhome buildings, constructing a total of 326 apartment or townhome units, two community buildings, a pool area, internal circulation driveways and parking areas, and open space areas. The primary driveway access to the Phase II site would be located along the south side of the internal project roadway.

Air Filtration Systems

The proximity of the project site to Business 80 is such that proposed residents could be exposed to notable levels of particulate matter and toxic air contaminants (TAC), as can occur for development adjacent to busy roadways. Proposed residential units will each include HVAC systems that will be equipped with MERV-13 filtration devices or devices that meet or exceed the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standards achieved by MERV-13 filters. All ventilation systems for the proposed residential units will include these features.

Building Exteriors

Proposed buildings exteriors would include cement plaster, vinyl windows, metal panels, metal railing, wood plank veneer, block, and stucco. Anticipated paint colors would include shades of

gray, taupe, yellow, tan, olive, and white. **Figure 6** shows the proposed color scheme and materials. The proposed community buildings for each standalone community would be 3-story structures with similar exterior paint and material uses, as would be used for the apartment structures (see **Figure 7**).

Parking Facilities

Parking for residential buildings would be provided as covered garages and open parking. The Phase I area would include 194 covered parking spaces in tuck under garages and 322 open space parking with carports, all located within the exterior fencing of the Phase I area. The Phase II area would include 172 covered parking spaces as garages and 256 open parking spaces. Residential parking would be provided on site as required by the City of Sacramento parking requirements.

Exterior Lighting

Onsite security lighting would be provided in the parking and pedestrian areas. Proposed outdoor lighting fixtures would include downward-shielding for overhead lighting fixtures and low-intensity exterior lighting to minimize fugitive light. Lighting mounted to the proposed buildings would be for safety and security purposes and would also be angled downward to provide targeted illumination and prevent fugitive light from illuminating adjacent areas.

Signs

The proposed project would include two monument signs, likely located within landscaped medians at the main project driveway for each standalone apartment site.

Landscaping

Onsite landscaping would be interspersed with trees and shrubs and would consist of turf areas along the street frontages, internal driveways, and internal walkways (see **Figure 8**). Within the project site, building frontages would be lined with planter boxes with trees and shrubs. Landscaping would be designed to meet California Assembly Bill (AB) 1881, Executive Order B-29-15, and the City's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Each standalone apartment community would also include a dog park, shade shelter, tot play area, and small open space areas.

Project Utilities

The project site is located within an area where infrastructure has been established to serve prior development on the project site. Thus, minimal offsite improvements would be anticipated to provide utility services to the residential project site, as described below. **Figure 9** shows the existing utility infrastructure in the vicinity of the project site.

Figure 6 Anticipated Color Scheme and Materials

Figure 7 Conceptual Community Buildings Elevations

Figure 8 Conceptual Landscape and Parking Lot Shading Plan

Figure 9 Existing Utility Infrastructure

Water Supply

The project site would be served by the City of Sacramento for domestic and fire water needs. The project site is located in an area of the City that is served by an extensive system of service mains ranging in size from 6 inches to 18 inches in diameters (see Figure 9). The City supplied water to the previously existing commercial uses (hotel and convention center) on the project site from the City water infrastructure that exists within the project vicinity. The proposed project would establish service laterals where existing service laterals into the project site require replacement or would not be sufficient to serve the project.

Wastewater and Drainage

Wastewater service for the project site would be collected by the Sacramento Area Sewer District's separate sewer system, conveyed to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (RegionalSan) interceptor system, and ultimately treated in the RegionalSan Sacramento Wastewater Treatment Plan (SRWTP), which is located in Elk Grove. The SASD sanitary sewer mains and stormwater drainage infrastructure would be accessed via existing on-site service laterals that served previous developed uses on the project site. Where existing access to sewer and drainage infrastructure is inadequate, new service laterals would be established with existing SASD and City infrastructure. The proposed wastewater and storm drainage systems would be separated within the project limits. The proposed wastewater system would include lines extended into the project site from the 21-inch sanitary sewer mane that flows south along the City Canal on the east side of the project site.

Since the project flows into the separate sewer system, post-construction stormwater flows may require treatment on-site. The proposed project is designed to provide on-site stormwater treatment in the form of a stormwater retention area, located between Royale Road and the City Canal, north of the internal project road (see **Figure 10**). Stormwater runoff from the project site would be diverted to the retention area, where it would be treated before discharge into the existing City Canal along the east side of the project site. Existing drainage lines that presently run from west to east through the project site would be diverted to intercept existing drainage infrastructure in Sacramento Inn Way, where it discharges into the City Canal near the southeast corner of the project site.

Energy

Electrical Service

The project site would be provided electrical service by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). The project site is served by an extensive system of transmission lines, which supplied power to previous development on the project site. Aside from new connections that may be necessary to tie project systems to the SMUD system, where previous connections for development on the project site would not be sufficient, no further offsite improvements to the SMUD electrical system would be required to serve the project site.

Figure 10 Drainage Plan

Natural Gas

The project site is provided natural gas service by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), which provides service to the City of Sacramento through both high- and low-pressure systems. Other than connections between the project buildings and the existing PG&E natural gas mains, where existing service laterals that served previous development on the project site would not be sufficient, no further improvements to the PG&E distribution system would be required.

Telecommunications

The proposed project would acquire telephone and data service from the current existing carrier(s) that include the project site within their service area. Connection(s) would be completed in existing telephonic and data manholes. The project applicant would coordinate with the City and other utility providers to determine the optimal solution for gaining access to adjacent lines, potentially including either open cuts or directional drilling that could be done in these manholes without severe traffic interference. Where open cuts are determined to be necessary, appropriate traffic management plans would be developed, subject to approval by the City of Sacramento. If feasible, service to the project site would be coordinated with SMUD in a common joint trench, in which a few 2-inch conduits would be added to the joint trench for telecommunication service.

Project Circulation

Vehicular Circulation

The vehicle circulation system, including internal roadways, vehicle accesses, and parking areas are shown in Figure 4, and described below. Primary vehicular access to the project site would be provided by an internal “spine” project roadway that would run east/west through the project site, from Sacramento Inn Way to the Arden Fair Mall parking area, creating a four-way intersection with internal drives in the Arden Fair Mall parking area. The spine roadway would include two roundabouts at the main driveways for each of the two standalone apartment communities. The main gated vehicle entry points for both the Phase I and Phase II communities would be located on the east and west sides of the internal project roadway, respectively, near the center of the project site. Each standalone community would include an additional driveways providing tenant vehicle access to Sacramento Inn Way. The main vehicle gates for the Phase I and Phase II communities would provide access to internal drives, parking, and garages. A small number of public parking spaces for visitor use would be located outside of the gated areas, near the primary entry gates of the Phase I and Phase II communities.

Pedestrian Facilities

The proposed project would develop a network of pedestrian facilities that would provide multiple pedestrian access points to and from each of the two standalone apartment communities at vehicle driveway locations and additional access points at non-vehicle pedestrian entry/exit points. The pedestrian network would provide for internal circulation within the gated perimeters of each standalone community and sidewalk improvements along both sides of the proposed internal spine project roadway, the east side of Sacramento Inn Way, the south side of Cormorant Way, and the west side of Royale Way. Internal pedestrian facilities would include a continuation of sidewalks along internal private streets, including crosswalks and other required safety

markings, and pedestrian pathways between the residential structures, where structures are not separated by private drives (see Figure 4). Further, as a condition of approval, the proposed project would construct a sidewalk between the project site and D.W. Babcock Elementary School.

Bicycle Facilities

Under existing conditions there are no bicycle facilities on the project site or in the project vicinity. However, as a condition of approval, the proposed project would install an on-street bicycle route between the project site, D.W. Babcock Elementary School, and existing bike lanes on El Camino Avenue. The proposed project would include the construction of at least 82 long-term and 44 short-term bicycle parking stalls on site.

Transit Facilities

The proposed project would not include the construction transit facilities. The nearest public transit routes to the project site are provided by Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) and include the following:

Route 22 runs generally east/west, between Del Paso Boulevard and Watt Avenue, with stops at the Arden Fair Mall, Royal Oaks Light Rail Station, and Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station.

Route 23 runs generally northeast/southwest, between the Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station and the Sunrise Mall, with key stops at the Royal Oaks Light Rail Station, Arden Fair Mall, Country Club Plaza.

Route 29 runs northeast/southwest, between Downtown Sacramento and the Madison Avenue/Dewey Drive intersection in Carmichael. Key stops include Sacramento Valley Station, the 7th Street/I Street Light Rail Station, the 8th Street/O Street Light Rail Station, St. Rose of Lima Park Light Rail Station, 8th Street/K Street Light Rail Station, Arden Fair Transit Center, and numerous stops along Arden Way and Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Routes 67 and 68 runs generally north and south, respectively, between the Florin Towne Center Transit Center and the Arden Fair Mall, stopping in Oak Park, Midtown Sacramento, and Cal Expo.

The proposed project would not create additional transit services.

Project Construction

As described above, the proposed project would be constructed in two phases including demolition of remaining structural elements from previous development on the project site, site preparation, and construction of the proposed structures. Phase I construction would take place prior to Phase II and would include the shared internal project roadway between the two communities separated by the phases of the proposed project. Demolition of the existing structures would include removal of all foundational elements and remaining pavement from areas previously uses as parking areas. Following demolition of any remaining elements from

previous development, the site would be prepared for construction, including grading, filling, excavation, and other earthwork. A heavy amount of grading is not anticipated as the project site is generally flat.

For each construction phase, the foundations/footings phase of construction would involve the pouring of concreate foundations throughout the proposed buildings footprints. The construction phase would involve the erection of wood, steel, concrete and/or precast concrete elements. This phase would involve the use of numerous cranes, loaders, welders, generators, concrete pumpers, and similar construction equipment. Interior and exterior finish work would involve a wide variety of construction activities involving creating and outfitting interior spaces and completing the exterior finish of the building, including plumbing, electrical, heating and air conditioning systems. Phase I construction would be anticipated to begin in March 2019 and last approximately 26 months. Phase II would be anticipated to begin construction in December 2020 and last approximately 24 months.

Construction Circulation

Project Site

During construction, active areas of the project site would be fenced off.

Road Closures

The proposed project would be anticipated to require closure of the south side existing route of Royale Road, to allow for construction of the internal project roadway. No temporary lane closures would be required along Sacramento Inn Way or Arden Way for the construction of driveway cut-ins, pedestrian facilities, and other improvements within the City's right-of-way.

Truck Routes

Construction vehicles would follow already established truck routes for the City which are largely determined by the streets that can access the project site. Inbound truck trips would access the project site from Sacramento Inn Way and the Arden Fair Mall parking lot. The direction of outbound truck trips would likely be to exit the project site traveling east on Sacramento Inn Way to Arden Way, turning right onto westbound Arden Way and accessing Business 80 from Arden Way.

Actions

The project requires the following planning approvals from the City of Sacramento:

- Site Plan and Design Review

Section IV – Infill Environmental Checklist

I. Aesthetics

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
I. AESTHETICS — **Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:**					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is within a residential and commercial setting. The project site is vacant and covered with remaining concrete and asphalt elements from the previous hotel and theater structures, which previously occupied the project site.

Adjacent uses to the project site include Business 80 immediately west of the project with onramps to Business 80 from Arden Way located along the southwest portion of the project site. Two-story residential apartments and condominiums are located immediately to the north and northeast of the project site and the Arden Fair Mall is located immediately east of the project site. Arden Way is located to the south of the project site.

Views to the site from Business 80 are partially obscured by mature street trees and generally comprise views of the paved parking and sidewalk areas and bare foundational elements, enclosed within chain link perimeter fencing throughout the project site.

Views from the project site to the north are generally limited to the 3-story residential apartments along the north side of the project site, a roadside billboard and multi-story office building. Views to the east include 2-story residential apartments and the Arden Fair Mall and parking lots. Views to the south include Arden Way and hotel and office uses along the south side of Arden Way. Views to the west include the elevated Business 80 immediately adjacent to the project site and the upper levels of multi-story hotel and office buildings further west beyond Business 80. Views

of Business 80 and distant buildings are obscured by a line of mature trees along the east side of Business 80 within the Caltrans right-of-way.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to aesthetics are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- substantially interfere with an important scenic resource or substantially degrade the view of an existing scenic resource;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR describes the existing visual conditions in the 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 (pages 4.13-1–4.13-6).

The Master EIR determined that the City of Sacramento is mostly built out, and a large amount of widespread, ambient light from urban uses already exists. The Master EIR states that new development permitted under the proposed 2035 General Plan could add sources of light that are similar to the existing urban light sources from any of the following: exterior building lighting, new street lighting, parking lot lights, and headlights of vehicular traffic. Because these potential, new sources of light would be similar to the current urban setting in amount and intensity of light, the day or nighttime views of adjacent sensitive land uses would not be significantly affected. Sensitive land uses would generally be residential uses.

The Master EIR concluded that General Plan Policy ER 7.1.3, which requires that misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary outdoor lighting be minimized; Policy LU 6.1.12, which includes a requirement for lighting to be shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses; and Policy 7.1.4 which prohibits new development from (1) using reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface and on the bottom three floors, (2) using mirrored glass, (3) using black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building, (4) using metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building, and (5) using exposed concrete that exceeds 50 percent of any

building, would ensure that impacts related to the production of the light and glare would be less than significant.

The Master EIR determined that the City of Sacramento is primarily built-out, however, new development associated with the 2035 General Plan could result in changes to important scenic resources as seen from visually sensitive locations. Visually sensitive public locations include viewpoints where a change to the visibility of an important scenic resource, or a visual change to the resource itself, would affect the general public. These locations include public plazas, trails, parks, parkways, or designated, publicly available and important scenic corridors.

The Master EIR concluded that General Plan Policy ER 7.1.1, which directs the City to avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects of new development on views from public places to the Sacramento and American Rivers and adjacent greenways, landmarks, and the State Capitol along Capitol Mall, and Policy ER 7.1.2, which states that the City shall require new development be located and designed to visually complement the natural environment/setting when near the Sacramento and American Rivers, would ensure that impacts related to substantial interference with an important scenic resource or a substantial degradation of the view of an existing scenic resource would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a-b. The City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Reports indicates that "scenic resources" can include natural open spaces, topographic formations, and landscapes.[2] Many people associate natural landforms and landscapes with scenic resources, such as oak woodlands, lakes, rivers, and streams. In an urban setting, scenic resources can also include urban open spaces and elements of the built environment. Examples of these would include parks, trails, pathways, nature centers, archaeological and historical resources, and buildings and infrastructure that includes distinctive architectural features.

The project site is within a residential and commercial setting, within a fully-developed urbanized environment. Views from the project site are limited to urbanized development, including commercial and residential development and roadway infrastructure, as described in the Environmental Setting, above. No scenic resources or scenic vistas are visible from the project site.

According to the Caltrans list of designated scenic highways under the California Scenic Highway Program, there are no highway segments within the City of Sacramento that are designated scenic. State Route 160 (SR 160) from the Contra Costa County line to the

[2] City of Sacramento, 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report, Appendix C, Background Report. p. 6-121.

south limit of the City of Sacramento is the only officially designated state scenic highway near the City of Sacramento. The project site is not visible from this portion of SR 160.[3] The project would have **no impact** on scenic vistas or scenic resources.

c. The proposed project is located in a heavily urbanized area and would replace urban uses (former hotel and entertainment uses) with another urban use (a residential infill development) in an area designated in the Sacramento General Plan for urban uses.

The proposed project would remain within the C-2 General Commercial Zone and be consistent with the General Plan Urban Center High land use designation for the project site. Building heights within the Urban Center High designation can range from two to twenty-four stories, with a maximum height for C-2 zoning of 65 feet. Development standards for the Urban Center High land use designation include minimum and maximum densities of 24.0 and 250 units-per-net-acre, respectively and minimum and maximum allowable floor area ratios (FARs) of 0.5 and 8.0. With a maximum height of 36 feet and 1 inch above ground level and a density of approximately 30 units per acre, the proposed project would be consistent with the land use designation and zoning for the project site.

The project would include more than 150 dwelling units (731 in total) and is therefore subject to the City's Site Plan and Design Review process pursuant to Chapter 17.808 of the City Code. The intent of the Site Plan and Design Review process is to ensure that the development: (1) is consistent with applicable plans and design guidelines; (2) is high quality and compatible with surrounding development; (3) is supported by adequate circulation, utility, and related infrastructure; (4) is water and energy efficient; and (5) avoids environmental effects to the extent feasible. The aspects of design considered in the site plan and design review process include architectural design, site design, adequacy of streets and accessways for all modes of travel, energy consumption, protection of environmentally sensitive features, safety, noise, and other relevant considerations.

Required compliance with the City's Site Plan and Design Review process would ensure that the proposed project is consistent with applicable plans and design guidelines, is of high quality, and is compatible with surrounding development, thus avoiding adverse impacts to visual character within the context of the urban setting into which the project would be constructed. Redevelopment of the project site and further urbanization of the area was contemplated in the Master EIR and evaluated in the Master EIR. Consequently, impacts related to degradation of the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings was **evaluated in a prior EIR**, and the impacts were determined to be less than significant. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

d. The Master EIR determined that the City of Sacramento is mostly built out, and a large amount of widespread, ambient light from urban uses already exists (page 4.13-5). The

[3] California Department of Transportation, 2017. California Scenic Highway Program. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/. Accessed April 23, 2018.

Master EIR states that new development permitted under the proposed 2035 General Plan could add sources of light that are similar to the existing urban light sources from any of the following: exterior building lighting, new street lighting, parking lot lights, and headlights of vehicular traffic. Because these potential, new sources of light would be similar to the current urban setting in amount and intensity of light, the day or nighttime views of adjacent sensitive land uses would not be significantly affected. Sensitive land uses would generally be residential uses.

The Master EIR concluded that General Plan Policy ER 7.1.3, which requires that misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary outdoor lighting be minimized; Policy LU 6.1.12, which includes a requirement for lighting to be shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses; and Policy 7.1.4 which prohibits new development from (1) using reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface and on the bottom three floors, (2) using mirrored glass, (3) using black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building, (4) using metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building, and (5) using exposed concrete that exceeds 50 percent of any building, would ensure that impacts related to the production of the light and glare would be less than significant.

Substantial ambient light from urban uses already exists in the project area. The project would include onsite security lighting in parking and pedestrian areas. Proposed outdoor lighting fixtures would include downward-shielding for overhead lighting fixtures and low-intensity exterior lighting to minimize fugitive light. Lighting mounted to the proposed buildings would be for safety and security purposes and would also be angled downward to provide targeted illumination and prevent fugitive light from illuminating adjacent areas. The proposed project's required compliance with General Plan Policy ER 7.1.3, Policy LU 6.1.12, and Policy 7.1.4, described above, would ensure that impacts related to the production of the light and glare would be consistent with assumed development in the Master EIR (page 4.13-4 to 4.13-5), for which impacts from light would be less than significant. Light and glare impacts were **evaluated in the prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measure

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to aesthetics, light, or glare.

References

California Department of Transportation, 2017. California Scenic Highway Program. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/. Accessed April 23, 2018.

City of Sacramento, 2014. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report, Appendix C, Background Report*. p. 6-121.

II. Agricultural and Forest Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. **Would the project:**					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

As described in the Background Report for the Master EIR, the proposed project is located within the City of Sacramento which is mostly urbanized, with limited amounts of active commercial agricultural lands remaining that support large-scale operations. Remaining agricultural land and commercial agricultural activity within the city limits are located in the southern area of the city and the northern area located outside the community plan area for the proposed project, mostly within the North Natomas Community Plan area. The entire boundary for the City of Sacramento, makes up the Policy Area for the 2035 General Plan. There are several parcels adjacent to the General Plan Policy Area under Williamson Act contract, but none within the Policy Area. The proposed project is located within the Policy Area, and is not designated or zoned for agriculture uses.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to agriculture and forestry resources are based on Appendix N of the 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 agricultural and forestry resources would occur if the project would:

- convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use;
- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
- conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production;
- result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

As described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, and according to the California Department of Conservation (CDC), the amount of agricultural land in Sacramento County decreased from 2008 to 2010. As of 2010, Sacramento County has 211,744 acres of Important Farmland. The net decrease of farmland for crops from 2008 to 2010 within Sacramento County was 1,374 acres. The CDC shows a consistent year-to-year decrease in Important Farmland between 2000 and 2010. This trend suggests that Important Farmland conversion is likely to continue throughout the County. Although the city still contains agricultural land or land designated as Important Farmland, much of this land within the Policy Area has been designated and zoned for development and in many instances has been entitled for future development, in part to limit the conversion of agricultural lands outside of the Policy Area. Based on this analysis conducted in the Master EIR, impacts related to the conversion of Important Farmland to a non-agricultural use was determined to be less than significant.

In addition, policies and existing regulations contained in the General Plan were determined as being able to ensure that land uses within the Policy Area would not adversely affect agricultural productivity on surrounding, nearby agricultural operations. Therefore, based on this analysis potential impacts related to incompatibility with surrounding agricultural operations outside the Policy Area was determined to be less than significant.

Further, and as previously stated above, the Master EIR noted that currently there are no properties under Williamson Act contracts within the Policy Area. The analysis also stated that existing regulations and proposed General Plan policies would ensure that land uses within the Policy Area would not be incompatible with adjacent agricultural operations. Due to potential

rezoning of properties currently zoned as A or A-OS requiring City approval, and because the proposed General Plan includes policies that recognize existing Williamson Act contracts to preserve agricultural land, potential future development proposed under the 2035 General Plan was determined not to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or with Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, based on this analysis potential impacts related to conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract was determined to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a-e The Master EIR discussed the potential impact of development under the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources (Master EIR, Chapter 4.1, pages 4.1-3 through 4.1-6). 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 (Master EIR, page 4.1-3). The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2035 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

The project site is fully developed and does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance). 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 near the project site. Existing agricultural uses outside of the City of Sacramento would be unaffected by development of the project site. For these reasons, development of the proposed infill project on the project site would result in **no impact** to agricultural or forest resources.

Findings

The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural or forest resources.

References

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2017. Sacramento County Important Farmland 2016 Map. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/sac16.pdf. Accessed April 18, 2018.

III. Air Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located within the City of Sacramento. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is the local agency with respect to air quality for all of Sacramento County, including the City of Sacramento. The City of Sacramento is within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which also includes all of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Sacramento, Shasta, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo, and Yuba counties, the western portion of Placer County, and the eastern portion of Solano County.

As required by the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) passed in 1970, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has identified six criteria air pollutants that are pervasive in urban environments and for which state and national health-based ambient air quality standards have been established. The U.S. EPA calls these pollutants "criteria air pollutants" because the agency has regulated them by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. Ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), particulate matter, and lead are the six criteria air pollutants. Notably, particulate matter is measured in two size ranges: PM_{10} for particles less than 10 microns in diameter, and $PM_{2.5}$ for particles less than 2.5 microns in diameter. **Table 3-1** summarizes the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) as well as the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS).

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) regional air quality monitoring network provides information on ambient concentrations of non-attainment criteria air pollutants. The Sacramento – Del Paso Manor monitoring station, the Bercut Drive station, and the T Street station are located 1.7 miles east, 1.8 miles west, and 2 miles southwest of the project site, respectively. Air quality monitoring data from these stations can be considered to be representative of air quality in the project area. **Table 3-2** presents a five-year summary of air pollutant concentration data collected at the Del Paso Manor monitoring station for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$.

TABLE 3-1
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS AND SACRAMENTO COUNTY ATTAINMENT STATUS

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	SF Air Basin Attainment Status for California Standard	Federal Primary Standard	SF Air Basin Attainment Status for Federal Standard
Ozone	8 Hour	0.070 ppm	Non-Attainment	0.070 ppm	Non-Attainment/ Moderate
	1 Hour	0.09 ppm	Non-Attainment	---	---
Carbon Monoxide	8 Hour	9.0 ppm	Attainment	9 ppm	Maintenance/Moderate
	1 Hour	20 ppm	Attainment	35 ppm	Maintenance/Moderate
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual Average	0.030 ppm	Attainment	0.053 ppm	Attainment
	1 Hour	0.18 ppm	Attainment	0.100 ppm	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual Average	---	---	0.030 ppm	Unclassified
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm	Attainment	0.14 ppm	Unclassified
	1 Hour	0.25 ppm	Attainment	0.075 ppm	Unclassified
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment	---	---
	24 Hour	50 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment	150 $\mu g/m^3$	Maintenance/Moderate
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 $\mu g/m^3$	Attainment	12.0 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment/ Moderate
	24 Hour	---	---	35 $\mu g/m^3$	Non-Attainment/ Moderate
Lead	Calendar Quarter	---	---	1.5 $\mu g/m^3$	Attainment/Unclassified
	30-Day Average	1.5 $\mu g/m^3$	Attainment	---	---
	3-Month Rolling Average	---	---	0.15 $\mu g/m^3$	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 $\mu g/m^3$	Attainment	No Federal Standard	---
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm	Unclassified	No Federal Standard	---
Vinyl Chloride	24 Hour	0.01 ppm	No information available	No Federal Standard -	---
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 Hour	Extinction of 0.23/km; visibility of 10 miles or more	Unclassified	No Federal Standard	---

NOTE:
ppm = parts per million
$\mu g/m^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter

SOURCES: CARB, *Air Quality Standards and Area Designations*, last updated June 12, 2018. Available: https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/desig.htm; U.S. EPA, Green Book – California Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants. Last updated on September 30, 2018. Available: https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_ca.html. Accessed October 12, 2018.

TABLE 3-2
SUMMARY OF AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA (2013-2017) [A]

Pollutant	Applicable Standard	Number of Days Standards Were Exceeded and Maximum Concentrations Measured [b]				
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ozone						
Max. 1-hour Conc. (ppm)		0.117	0.101	0.112	0.107	0.102
Days 1-hour State Std. Exceeded	>0.09 ppm	2	2	2	5	1
Max. 8-hour Conc. (ppm)		**0.087**	**0.077**	**0.089**	**0.090**	**0.079**
Days 8-hour National Std. Exceeded	>0.070 ppm	6	16	8	10	5
Days 8-hour State Std. Exceeded	>0.070 ppm	3	1	5	4	1
Suspended Particulates (PM_{10})						
Max. 24-hour Conc. National/State (µg/m^3)		56.0/63.5	40.0/42.8	42.0/51.4	31.0/42.2	59.0/65.8
Estimated Days Over 24-hour National Std.[c]	>150 µg/m^3	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Days Over 24-hour State Std.[c]	>50 µg/m^3	4	0	0	0	19
State Annual Average (µg/m^3)	>20 µg/m^3	23.2	18.8	18.0	17.6	20.5
Suspended Particulates ($PM_{2.5}$)						
Max. 24-hour Conc. National (µg/m^3)		53.8	32.0	54.5	46.8	42.0
Estimated Days Over 24-hour National Std.[d]	>35 µg/m^3	9	0	9	3	6
Annual Average (µg/m^3)	>12 µg/m^3 [b]	11.5	8.8	10.4	9.7	14.0

NOTES:
conc. = concentration; ppm = parts per million; ppb=parts per billion;
µg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter
ND = No data or insufficient data.
a. Monitoring data presented is from the Del Paso Manor monitoring station
b. Number of days exceeded is for all days in a given year, except for particulate matter. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are monitored every six days.
c. Particulate matter sampling schedule of one out of every six days, for a total of approximately 60 samples per year. Estimated days exceeded mathematically estimates how many days concentrations would have been greater than the level of the standard had each day been monitored.

SOURCE: CARB, iADAM: Air Quality Data Statistics, 2013-2017. Available: https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php. Accessed October 12, 2018.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project air quality impacts are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, 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 general plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR:

- 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 construction emissions of PM_{10} would result in a significant impact, unless all feasible Best Available Control Technologies/Best Management Practices (BACT/BMPs) are implemented, with implementation increases above 80 pounds per day and 14.6 tons/year;
- Any construction emissions of $PM_{2.5}$, unless all feasible BACT/BMPs are applied, then 82 pounds per day and 15 tons/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);
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

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).

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2035 General Plan, primarily in the Environmental Resources Element, that addressed air pollutant emissions (see Master EIR, Chapter 4.2) such as the following goals and policies that would mitigate air pollutant emissions from development:

> **Goal ER 6.1: Improved Air Quality.** Improve the health and sustainability of the community through improved regional air quality and reduced greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.
>
> > ***Policy ER 6.1.1: Maintain Ambient Air Quality Standards.*** The City shall work with the California Air Resources Board and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet State and Federal ambient air quality standards in order to protect residents, regardless of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socioeconomic status, or geographic location, from the health effects of air pollution.
> >
> > ***Policy ER 6.1.2: New Development.*** The City shall review proposed development projects to ensure projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) through project design.

> ***Policy ER 6.1.3: Emissions Reduction.*** The City shall require development projects that exceed SMAQMD ROG and NO_x operational thresholds to incorporate design or operational features that reduce emissions equal to 15 percent from the level that would be produced by an unmitigated project.
>
> ***Policy ER 6.1.4: Sensitive Uses.*** The City shall coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and will impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.
>
> ***Policy ER 6.1.14: Zero-Emission and Low-Emission Vehicle Use.*** The City shall encourage the use of zero-emission vehicles, low-emission vehicles, bicycles and other non-motorized vehicles, and car-sharing programs by requiring sufficient and convenient infrastructure and parking facilities in residential developments and employment centers to accommodate these vehicles.
>
> ***Policy ER 6.1.15: Preference for Reduced-Emission Equipment.*** The City shall give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and contracts for services (e.g., garbage collection), as well as businesses that practice sustainable operations.
>
> ***Policy ER 6.1.16: Air Quality Education.*** The City shall educate the public about air quality standards, health effects, and efforts they can make to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Sacramento region.

In addition, the following policy from the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses development adjacent to freeway, such as the proposed project.

> ***Policy LU 2.7.5 Development along Freeways.*** The City shall promote high-quality development character of buildings along freeway corridors and protect the public from the adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration, using such techniques as:
>
> - Requiring extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway fronting elevation
> - Establish a consistent building line, articulating and modulating building elevations and heights to create visual interest
> - Include design elements that reduce noise and provide for proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions (RDR/MPSP)

Policies in the 2035 General Plan were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan to a less than significant level.

The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of TACs as a potential impact. Several policies in the 2035 General Plan were found to reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. Policy LU 2.7.5 (Development along Freeways) requires extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway fronting elevation, and design elements that reduce noise and provide for proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions from buildings. In addition, Policy ER 6.1.4 (Sensitive Uses) requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs, and impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. According to the SMAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (CEQA Guide), if a project's maximum daily operational emissions of precursors ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ exceed the District's thresholds of significance, then the project will have a significant impact to air quality. By exceeding the District's mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$, the project will be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality planning efforts. As discussed under b) below, project operational emissions would not exceed the applicable SMAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with local air quality planning efforts.

The proposed project is consistent with the 2035 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan promotes the goals of the regional air quality plans to reach attainment of federal and state ozone and PM standards. Because, redevelopment of the project site was contemplated in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master EIR, and the proposed project is within the envelope of assumed development for the project site, as analyzed in the Master EIR, the project would not cause new specific effects not addressed in the prior EIR. This impact was fully **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

b. As shown in Table 3-1, Sacramento County is currently designated nonattainment with respect to the ozone and PM_{10} California ambient air quality standards. For the purposes of this analysis, emissions that exceed the SMAQMD's construction and operational emissions would be considered to lead to a violation or contribute to a violation of the ambient air quality standards for O_3 precursors (ROG and NOx) and PM_{10}.

Construction Emissions

The proposed project would build a residential development that would include up to 731 multi-family apartment units and associated amenities available for use by apartment residents. The project would be constructed in two sequential phases including demolition of remaining structural elements from previous development on the project site, site preparation, and construction of the proposed structures. Phase I construction is anticipated to begin in March 2019 and last approximately 26 months. Phase II is anticipated to begin construction in December 2020 and last approximately 24 months.

Construction activities would include demolition, site preparation work, foundation work, and new building framing and finishing. Demolition of the existing structures would include removal of all foundational elements and remaining pavement from areas previously uses as parking areas. Following demolition of any remaining elements from previous development, the site would be prepared for construction, including grading, filling, excavation, and other earthwork. A heavy amount of grading is not anticipated as

the project site is generally flat. The foundations/footings phase of construction would involve the pouring of concreate foundations throughout the proposed buildings footprints. The building construction phase would involve the erection of wood, steel, concrete and/or precast concrete elements and would involve the use of numerous cranes, loaders, welders, generators, concrete pumpers, and similar construction equipment. Interior and exterior finish work would involve a wide variety of construction activities involving creating and outfitting interior spaces and completing the exterior finish of the building, including plumbing, electrical, heating and air conditioning systems.

Construction emissions were estimated for the proposed project using the methods contained in SMAQMD's *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*.[4] The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 was used to quantify construction-related emissions of NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ from off-road equipment, haul trucks associated with demolition, on-road worker vehicle emissions, and vendor delivery trips. Model outputs and more detailed assumptions can be found in **Appendix A**. The maximum daily unmitigated project construction emissions are presented in **Tables 3-3 and 3-4**, respectively. These tables compare emissions from project construction to SMAQMD's NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ construction thresholds.

As shown in Table 3-3, maximum daily construction NO_X emissions would not exceed the SMAQMD significance thresholds during construction. However, according to the SMAQMD CEQA guidance, any project-related construction emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would result in a significant impact, unless all feasible Best Available Control Technologies/Best Management Practices (BACT/BMPs) are implemented.

TABLE 3-3
UNMITIGATED MAXIMUM DAILY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS[1]

Construction Year	NO_X (ppd)	PM_{10} (ppd)	$PM_{2.5}$ (ppd)	PM_{10} (tpy)	$PM_{2.5}$ (tpy)
2019	54.6	21.9	12.3	0.8	0.5
2020	29	5.7	2.3	0.7	0.3
2021	26.3	5.5	2.1	0.7	0.3
2022	24	5.3	2	0.5	0.2
SMAQMD Mitigated Thresholds[2]	85	0	0	0	0
Maximum Project Emissions	54.6	21.9	12.3	0.8	0.5
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NOTES:
PPD = pounds per day
tpy = tons per year

1. Project construction emissions estimates were made using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. See Appendix A for model outputs and more detailed assumptions.
2. SMAQMD has established a zero emissions threshold for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ when projects do not implement their BMPs.

SOURCE: Environmental Science Associates (ESA), 2018. Air Quality Technical Appendix for Arden Gateway project (Appendix A).

4 SMAQMD, *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. Adopted December 2009.

TABLE 3-4
MITIGATED MAXIMUM DAILY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS[1]

Construction Year	NO_X (ppd)	PM_{10} (ppd)	$PM_{2.5}$ (ppd)	PM_{10} (tpy)	$PM_{2.5}$ (tpy)
2019	54.6	11.2	6.8	0.6	0.3
2020	29	5.3	2.2	0.7	0.3
2021	26.3	5.1	2.1	0.7	0.3
2022	24	5	1.9	0.5	0.2
SMAQMD Thresholds[2]	85	80	82	14.6	15
Maximum Project Emissions	54.6	11.2	6.8	0.7	0.3
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	No	No	No	No

NOTES:
PPD = pounds per day; tpy = tons per year

1. Project construction emissions estimates were made using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. See Appendix A for model outputs and more detailed assumptions.
2. SMAQMD has established a zero emissions threshold for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ when projects do not implement their BMPs.

SOURCE: Environmental Science Associates (ESA), 2018. Air Quality Technical Appendix for Arden Gateway project (Appendix A).

SMAQMD maintains the Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices (Best Management Practices) list, which provides BMPs that are considered feasible for controlling fugitive dust from a construction site.[5] These measures (included as **Appendix B**) generally include watering of exposed surfaces, covering or maintaining of free board space on haul truck, regular removal of trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent roads, limited vehicle speeds on unpaved roads, and completion of all paving activities as soon as possible. SMAQMD's list of construction BMPs also includes measures for the control of exhaust emissions. These measures generally include the minimization of idling time and the posting of signage for this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.

The 2035 General Plan includes Policy ER 6.1.2, which requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure they incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for ROG, NO_X, and PM through project design. In practice, the City requires these emission control practices be implemented for projects as conditions of approval (COAs), as is required for the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would include BMPs to minimize onsite construction emissions already recommended by the SMAQMD. Therefore, project-related emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are compared to the SMAQMD's mitigated significance threshold of 80 and 82 pounds per day, respectively.

All grading, excavation, and earth-moving activities would incorporate SMAQMD's BMPs for fugitive dust. As shown in Table 3-3, construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions that would not exceed the SMAQMD mitigated significance thresholds for each construction year. This is

5 SMAQMD, 2017. Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (Best Management Practices). Adopted December 2009, Revised September 2010, Revised May 2017.

consistent with the finding in the Master EIR, which determined that individual construction projects that are consistent with the General Plan would comply with all SMAQMD-required mitigation measures, which would reduce project-level construction emission to below applicable thresholds. The project as proposed is consistent with development assumptions for the site as contemplated in the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts related to construction emissions were fully **analyzed in a prior EIR** and the impacts were determined to be less than significant. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Operational Emissions

Over the long-term, the proposed project would increase operational emissions primarily by generating motor vehicle trips. Area sources (including water and space heaters that are fired by natural gas, and landscape maintenance equipment that are typically gasoline powered) would contribute primarily to ROG emissions. Operational emissions in the year 2023, when the project would reach full operation capacity, were calculated using CalEEMod. The key inputs to CalEEMod included the proposed project land uses. Modeling assumptions and output files are included in Appendix A.

According to the SMAQMD CEQA guidance, project-related operational emissions that exceed zero pounds per day of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would result in a significant impact, unless all feasible BACT/BMPs are implemented. Similar to construction emissions, SMAQMD provides a list of feasible BMPs for operational emissions for land use development projects (see **Appendix C**). These BMPs generally include requirements for compliance with rules that control operational PM and NO_X emissions, such as rules regarding wood burning devices, boilers, water heaters, generators and other PM control rules that may apply to equipment to be located at the project site. Additional SMAQMD BMPs that would be applicable to the proposed project include compliance with mandatory measures in the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) that pertain to efficient use of natural gas for space and water heating; and compliance with mandatory measures in the California Green Building Code (Title 24, Part 11) that pertain to operational PM emissions, such as compliance with anti-idling regulations for diesel powered commercial motor vehicles, pedestrian infrastructure connectivity, and transit accessibility.

Each of the operational BMPs identified by SMAQMD are required through either SMAQMD or statewide regulations. The proposed project would comply with all local and statewide regulations. With the consideration of these design features in the proposed project's final design, SMAQMD's mitigated PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ thresholds would apply. As shown in Table 3-4, the operational emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ generated under the proposed project would not exceed the SMAQMD's significance thresholds for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ after all feasible BMPs are applied. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed air quality standards.

The 2035 General Plan includes Policy ER 6.1.3, which requires individual development projects that would exceed the SMAQMD ROG and NO_X operational thresholds of

65 pounds-per-day to incorporate design or operational features that result in at least a 15 percent reduction in emissions; and Policy ER 6.1.2, which requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure construction and operation of projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce emissions through project design.

Redevelopment of the project site and further urbanization of the area was contemplated in the Master EIR and evaluated in the Master EIR. Consequently, impacts related to operational emissions were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. While the Master EIR concluded impacts of cumulative development under the General Plan are significant and unavoidable, the proposed project's impact will be less than significant. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Traffic

Operational traffic generated during project operation would consist primarily of resident vehicle trips. These traffic volumes would contribute to the existing and future intersection volumes in the vicinity of the project site. Increased traffic volumes at intersections would increase delays and idling. Intersections that are categorized as a level of service (LOS) E or F would result in increased delays and idling times. These intersections have the potential to create CO hotspots, which is an exceedance of the 1- or 8-hour state CO standard. A CO hotspot can result in the exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to unhealthy CO concentrations. Based on the traffic study for the project, average daily traffic generated would be 5,531 trips. Roadway segments in the vicinity of the project are expected to maintain the same LOS as under existing conditions, and intersection volumes would be much lower than the screening threshold of 31,600 vehicles per hour in SMAQMD's CEQA Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County; therefore, no exceedances of the CO 1- hour or 8-hour standard would occur at any of intersections affected by the proposed project. Traffic generated by the project is consistent with what was assumed in the 2035 General Plan for the project site. For these reasons, impacts to local CO concentrations from the proposed project are determined to have been **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Summary

According to SMAQMD guidance, if a project's operational emissions, with the incorporation of all applicable BMPs does not exceed the SMAQMD's operational significance thresholds, it will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in precursor and PM emissions, for which Sacramento County is in nonattainment status with respect to one or more of the NAAQS or SAAQS.[6] As discussed above, the proposed project would include BMPs to minimize onsite construction emissions already recommended by the SMAQMD. As shown in Table 3-3, construction emissions of PM_{10}

[6] Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), 2009. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. Adopted December 2009.

and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the SMAQMD mitigated significance threshold of 80 and 82 pounds per day, respectively.

Emissions generated by short term construction have the potential to generate high levels of PM_{10}, which are primarily associated with fugitive dust emissions during site preparation or grading. Exhaust emissions of NO_X and PM_{10} are also generated by off-road construction equipment such as graders, dozers and excavators.

According to SMAQMD CEQA guidance, if a project's construction and operational emissions would not exceed any of the SMAQMD's recommended mass emission thresholds, its contribution to cumulative air quality of the area would also be considered less than significant.[7] Since the proposed project would implement all feasible BMPs recommended by SMAQMD and construction emissions of NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are projected to be well below the SMAQMD significance thresholds, project emissions would not contribute significantly to the cumulative air quality of the region which is currently designated as nonattainment with respect to ozone and PM standards. Because, redevelopment of the project site and further urbanization of the area was contemplated in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master EIR, and the proposed project is within the envelope of assumed development for the project site, as analyzed in the Master EIR, this impact was **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

c. Short-term project construction activities would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust emissions, which is categorized as TAC. The majority of DPM exhaust emissions that would be generated by project construction would be from the use of diesel off-road equipment with a smaller amount generated by the use of heavy-duty trucks for the transportation of building material, construction waste, and equipment to and from the project site.

Existing receptors are located in the form of single family residences to the east and southeast, within 100 feet of the project site. The dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor affecting health risk from exposure to TACs. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the duration of exposure to the substance. According to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk should be assessed based on 9-, 30-, and/or 70-year exposure periods, to determine the potential for health risk to sensitive receptors, including cancer or chronic non-cancer health effects, resulting from long-term exposure to TAC emissions such as DPM.[8] Concentrations of mobile-source DPM emissions are typically reduced by 70 percent at a distance of approximately 500 feet.

SMAQMD has not adopted a methodology for analyzing such impacts and has not recommended that health risk assessments be completed for construction-related emissions of TACs. Several policies in the 2035 General Plan would reduce TAC

7 SMAQMD, *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. Adopted December 2009.

8 OEHHA, *Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*. February 2015.

exposure from construction. These include General Plan Policy ER 6.1.2, which requires proposed development projects to incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) through project design and Policy ER 6.1.4 which requires consideration of current guidance provided by CARB and SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, and imposing appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety. The proposed project would be consistent with assumed development analyzed in the Master EIR and would implement SMAQMD's construction BMPs. In addition, due to the intermittent nature of construction activities, the relatively short-term nature of construction activities in any one location, and the varying distances to sensitive receptors as construction proceeds, the proposed project would not result in significant construction-related health risks. This impact would be less than significant and was fully **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Although operation of the proposed project would not include any new stationary sources of TACs, there are existing sources of TAC emissions in the vicinity of the proposed project site that could expose future residents of the proposed residences to significant health risks. Business 80 is located within 100 feet of the project site's northern boundary. According to CARB and SMAQMD guidance, stationary sources within a half mile and mobile sources (e.g., highways, rail lines) within 500 feet of a sensitive land use may pose a health risk.

SMAQMD has prepared the Mobile Sources Air Toxics (MSAT) Protocol[9] to provide guidance to local land use jurisdictions on assessing and disclosing potential cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from major roadways and railways. The MSAT Protocol includes a risk mapping tool, guidance document, detailed methodology document, and guidance on exposure reduction measures. This tool gives a conservative estimate of cancer risk and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations for points extending two kilometers out from roadways, where at least 100,000 vehicles travel daily on average, and rail lines, within Sacramento County.

Based on the MSAT Protocol mapping tool, the health risk to receptors at the project site boundary nearest to Business 80 is 159 per million cancer risk from DPM and 34 per million cancer risk from TAC, over and above regional background cancer risk. $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at this point would be 8.9 $\mu g/m^3$.[10] These are the risks modeled by the District for emissions from Business 80 and do not include risks from other stationary sources in the area.

Several policies in the 2035 General Plan would reduce TAC exposures. Policy LU 2.7.5 (Development along Freeways) requires extensive landscaping and trees along the

9 SMAQMD, Guidance Document for the Mobile Sources Air Toxics Protocol, v1.1, July 2018.

10 SMAQMD, Mobile Sources Air Toxics Protocol – Mapping Tool, Available: http://sacramentorisk.azurewebsites.net/.

freeway fronting elevation, and design elements that reduce noise and provide for proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions from buildings. In addition, Policy ER 6.1.4 (Sensitive Uses) requires the City to coordinate with SMAQMD in evaluating exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs, and impose appropriate conditions on projects to protect public health and safety.

Consistent with these policies, all residential units proposed by the project include HVAC systems that will be equipped with air filtration devices that meet or exceed the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standards achieved by MERV-13 filters. The U.S. EPA reports particle size removal efficiency for filters rated MERV 13 of 90 percent for particles in the size range of 1 to 3 µm and less than 75 percent for particles 0.3 to 1 µm.[11] Studies by the South Coast AQMD indicate that MERV 13 filters could achieve reductions of about 60 percent for ultra-fine particles and about 35 percent for black carbon, which would reduce exposure risk to project receptors.[12] Though the effect from the environment to the project receptors does not constitute an impact under CEQA, with the inclusion of HVAC filtration systems as part of project design, the project receptors would not be exposed to health risks from substantial concentration of TACs.

As the proposed project would include design features recommended by the SMAQMD to reduce exposure of project receptors to health risks from existing sources consistent with policies in the 2035 General plan, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would be a less than significant impact that was already analyzed in the Master EIR. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

d. The SMAQMD has identified typical odor sources in its *CEQA Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. These include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, composting and green waste facilities, recycling facilities, petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, painting and coating operations, rendering plants, and food packaging plants. The Master EIR (page 4.2-12) determined that the 2035 General Plan would not result in major sources of odor as the plan would not include or contemplate construction of any of the common types of facilities that are known to produce odors. The 2035 General Plan could include commercial and industrial land uses that could be new sources of odor. Regardless, all emissions of odors would be subject to SMAQMD's Nuisance Rule (Rule 402), which prohibits discharge of nuisance odors.

The proposed project would not include uses that have been identified by SMAQMD or the City as potential sources of objectionable odors. In addition, the proposed project

[11] U.S. EPA 2009. Residential Air Cleaners Second Edition. A Summary of Available Information. Indoor Air Quality (IAQ). EPA 402- F-09-002 | Revised August 2009 | www.epa.gov/iaq

[12] South Coast AQMD. 2009. Pilot Study of High Performance Air Filtration for Classrooms Applications. Draft – October 2009.

would not be located within one mile of any facilities or uses known to generate objectionable odors.

The Master EIR (page 4.2-12) determined that diesel exhaust emissions from construction would have the potential to emit adverse odor from diesel exhaust, however such odors would be intermittent and temporary, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. Diesel equipment used during construction of the proposed project could produce odorous exhaust, but equipment use in any one area of the project site would be temporary and potential odors would not affect a substantial number of people.

Development of the project site is consistent with what was assumed in the 2035 General Plan for which the Master EIR determined less than significant impacts with respect to odors. Therefore, the proposed project's odor impact was fully **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new project specific impacts not addressed in the Master EIR.

Findings

The proposed project would not result in any impacts related to air quality that were not identified and evaluated in a previous EIR.

References

California Air Resources Board (CARB), 2018a. *Air Quality Standards and Area Designations*, last updated June 12, 2018. Available: https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/desig.htm.

California Air Resources Board, 2018b. iADAM: Air Quality Data Statistics, 2013-2017. Available: https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php. Accessed October 12, 2018.

Environmental Science Associates (ESA), 2018. Air Quality Technical Appendix for Arden Gateway project (Appendix A).

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), 2009. *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*. Adopted December 2009. Available: http://www.airquality.org/businesses/ceqa-land-use-planning/ceqa-guidance-tools. Accessed October, 2018.

SMAQMD, 2017. Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (Best Management Practices). Adopted December 2009, Revised September 2010, Revised May 2017.

SMAQMD, 2018a. Guidance Document for the Mobile Sources Air Toxics Protocol, v1.1, July 2018.

SMAQMD, 2018b. Mobile Sources Air Toxics Protocol – Mapping Tool, Available: http://sacramentorisk.azurewebsites.net/. Accessed October, 2018.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), 2015. *Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*. February 2015.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2018. Green Book – California Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants. Last updated on September 30, 2018. Available: https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_ca.html. Accessed October 12, 2018.

IV. Biological Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*No Impact*	*Analyzed in Prior EIR*	*Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies*
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

Regional

The project site is located within an urban area the City of Sacramento. The regional setting is primarily urban with scattered ruderal grassland, oak woodland, and aquatic features including ponds, freshwater marshes, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools. The American River and surrounding riparian corridor are located approximately 1.4 miles to the south of the project site.

Local

The 25-acre project site is located south and east of Sacramento Inn Way, southwest and west of Cormorant, and north of Royale Avenue. The project site is comprised primarily of remnant parking, driveway and foundational elements from previous development. Non-native vegetation

is dispersed throughout the site in areas that were previously maintained as landscaped areas for previous development on the site. Potential resources in the project vicinity include a stand of eucalyptus trees and low-lying non-native vegetation within the Caltrans right-of-way for Business 80 to the west of the project site. A concrete-lined drainage ditch runs along the south east boundary of the project site. Each of these areas are heavily disturbed. The project site includes a surface parking lots, foundations for a former inn, and scattered patches of unmaintained landscaping comprised of nonnative vegetation.

Sensitive Biological Resources

Information in this section is based on data collected during a reconnaissance-level biological survey conducted on August 15, 2018 and review of other relevant documentation for the project site and surrounding vicinity including:

- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) records search, including a five (5) mile radius around the project site[13]
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) List of Threatened and Endangered Species[14]
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants[15]
- Sacramento Draft 2035 General Plan[16]
- Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (EIR)[17]

Special-status species considered for this analysis are based on the CNDDB, CNPS, and USFWS lists. A comprehensive list of special-status plant and wildlife species considered in the analysis is provided in **Appendix D**. The list includes the common and scientific names for each species, regulatory status (federal, State, local, CNPS), habitat descriptions, and a discussion of the potential for occurrence within the project site.

Special-status species include:

- 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);

[13] California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2018. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Special Status Species Occurrences on the Sacramento East and 8 Surrounding Quadrangles. Accessed August 20, 2018.

[14] United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. List of Threatened and Endangered Species that may occur in your Proposed Project Location, and/or may be Affected by your Proposed Project. Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC). Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2018-SLI-3015. Event Code: 08ESMF00-2018-E-08976. Available: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/. Accessed August 20, 2018.

[15] California Native Plant Society (CNPS), 2018. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-03). California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, CA. Available: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org. Accessed August 20, 2018.

[16] City of Sacramento, 2015. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan.

[17] City of Sacramento, 2015. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report.

- 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 the USFWS, or as species of special concern to the CDFW; and
- Plants or animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Special-Status Wildlife

Four of the 26 special-status wildlife species documented on the Sacramento East quadrangle and 8 surrounding quadrangles have the potential to occur within the project site. These include suitable nesting habitat for the state threatened Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*); state fully protected white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and purple martin (*Progne subis*), two state species of special concern.

Migratory Birds and Other Birds of Prey

Migratory birds have the potential to nest within the mature trees in the vicinity of the project site to the west.

Special-Status Plants

The project site does not provide habitat for the 17 special-status plants documented on the Sacramento East quadrangle and 8 surrounding quadrangles.

Sensitive Habitats and Special-Status Plant Communities

The project site does not contain sensitive natural communities since it is completely developed or ruderal.

Waters of the U.S.

The project site does not contain wetlands or waters of the U.S.

Federal Endangered Species Act

Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) prohibits the unauthorized "take" of any fish or wildlife species listed as threatened or endangered, including the destruction of habitat that could hinder species recovery. The term "take" is defined by the Endangered Species Act as to "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct."

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) prohibits the take of plant and animal species that the California Fish and Game Commission have designated as either threatened or endangered in California. "Take" in the context of the CESA means to hunt, pursue, kill, or capture a listed species, as well as any other actions that may result in adverse impacts when a

person is attempting to take individuals of a listed species. The take prohibitions also apply to candidates for listing under the CESA.

California Fish and Game Code

Under Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code, it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation under it. Section 3503.5 prohibits the take, possession, or destruction of any birds in the orders Falconiformes (hawks) or Strigiformes (owls), or of their nests and eggs. Code Sections 3511 (birds), 4700 (mammals), 5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and 5515 (fish) allow the designation of a species as fully protected. This is a greater level of protection than that afforded by the CESA. Except for take related to scientific research, all take of fully protected species is prohibited.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Federal law protects raptors, migratory birds, and their nests. The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (15 USC 703-711 and 16 USC Section 7.3, Supp I 1989), 50 CFR Part 21, and 50 CFR Part 10, prohibits killing, possessing or trading in migratory birds. Executive Order 13186 (January 11, 2001) requires that any project with federal involvement address impact of federal actions on migratory birds.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to biological resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, an impact would be significant if the proposed project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- Adversely affect a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or the USFWS;
- Adversely affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW and the USFWS;
- Adversely affect federally protections wetlands or waters of the U.S.
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.

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 General Plan Policy Area. 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, special–status mammals, and contribute to regional loss of special-status plant or wildlife species or their 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. Although determined to be significant and unavoidable, proposed policies require all feasible impact-reducing actions as part of the 2035 General Plan. General Plan Policy ER 2.1.1 calls for the City to encourage new development to preserve on-site natural elements that contribute to the community's native plant and wildlife species value and to its aesthetic character; General Plan 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 impact compensation; General Plan Policy ER 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the California Department Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies in the protection of resources; and General Plan Policy ER 3.1.3 requires the City to preserve trees of significance.

The Master EIR concluded that the cumulative effects of development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan would be significant and unavoidable as they related to effects on special-status plant species (Impact 4.3-1), reduction of habitat for special-status invertebrates (Impact 4.3-2), loss of habitat for special-status birds (Impact 4.3-3), loss of habitat for special-status amphibians and reptiles (Impact 4.3-4), loss of habitat for special-status mammals (Impact 4.3-4), special-status fish (Impact 4.3-6) and, in general, loss of riparian habitat, wetlands and sensitive natural communities such as elderberry savannah (Impacts 4.3-7 through 4.3-9).

The following 2035 General Plan goals and policies relevant to project activities would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the 2035 Master EIR and are considered mitigation measures for the following relevant project-level and cumulative impacts:

> **Goal ER 2.1: Natural and Open Space Protection**. Protect and enhance open space, natural areas, and significant wildlife and vegetation in the city as integral parts of a sustainable environment within a larger regional ecosystem.
>
> > **Policy ER 2.1.1**: **Resource Preservation**. The City shall encourage new development to preserve on-site natural elements that contribute to the community's native plant and wildlife species value and to its aesthetic character.
> >
> > **Policy ER 2.1.10**: **Habitat Assessments and Impact Compensation**. The City shall consider the potential impact on sensitive plants and wildlife for each project requiring discretionary approval. If site conditions are such that potential habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species may be present, the City shall require habitat assessments, prepared by a qualified biologist, for sensitive plant and wildlife species. If the habitat assessment determines that suitable habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species is

present, then either (1) protocol-level surveys shall be conducted (where survey protocol has been established by a resource agency), or, in the absence of established survey protocol, a focused survey shall be conducted consistent with industry-recognized best practices; or (2) suitable habitat and presence of the species shall be assumed to occur within all potential habitat locations identified on the project site. Survey Reports shall be prepared and submitted to the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (depending on the species) for further consultation and development of avoidance and/or mitigation measures consistent with state and federal law.

Policy ER 2.1.11: Agency Coordination. The City shall coordinate with State and Federal resource agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)) to protect areas containing rare or endangered species plants and animals.

City Tree Ordinance

The City of Sacramento (City) has adopted an ordinance to protect trees as a significant resource to the community (City Code Title 12, Chapter 12.56, Ordinance 2016-0026 Section 4.) The City's policy is to retain all trees when possible regardless of their size. When circumstances will not allow for retention, permits are required to remove trees that are within City jurisdiction. City trees are defined as the trunk of any tree partially or completely located in a City park, on real property the City owns in fee, or on a public right-of-way, including any street, road, sidewalk, park strip, mow strip, or alley. The City considers several factors when making a determination for tree removal including, but not limited to, the health and structural condition of the tree, the desirability of the species, and the need for the proposed work in order to develop the property.

In addition, the ordinance protects the following trees on private property:

- All native trees at 12 inch diameters at standard height (DSH). Native trees include: coast, interior, valley and blue oaks, California sycamore, and buckeye.
- All native trees at 12 inch diameters at standard height (DSH). Native trees include: coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizeni*), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), and blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), and buckeye (*Aesculus californica*). The DSH is defined as the diameter of a tree measured at 4.5 feet above natural grade.
- All trees at 24-inch diameter at standard height (DSH) on private property that is an undeveloped lot or does not include any single unit or duplex dwellings.
- A tree that has a DSH of 32 inches or more located on private property that includes any single unit or duplex dwellings.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. Although there is ongoing human and vehicular noise associated with Business 80 located just to the west of the project site and Arden Fair Mall located just to the east, project construction noise could disturb nesting behavior of raptors and migratory birds, which could result in nest abandoned by the adults and mortality of chicks and eggs. If nesting migratory birds or raptors are killed as a direct result of the project, the situation would be considered a violation of the California Fish and Game Code §3503.5. The loss of an active nest or take of individuals from construction would, therefore, be a significant impact. Conformance with 2035 General Plan Policy ER 2.1.10, Habitat Assessment and Impact Compensation, would ensure that preconstruction surveys are conducted for any construction activities that would occur between February 1 and September 15 (nesting season); surveying suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of construction activities. Conformance with Policy ER 2.1.10 would further require that preconstruction surveys would be conducted by a qualified biologist, whom would determine if protocol-level surveys should be conducted or presence of a species shall be assumed. Under the policy, if protocol-level surveys are required or if presence of a species is assumed, survey reports would be prepared and submitted to appropriate agencies including the City, CDFW, and USFWS, for further consultation and development of avoidance and/or mitigation measures. These measures would be likely to include monitoring by a qualified biologist during construction activity or no-work buffer zones established with differing requirements depending on species and site-specific conditions. Implementation of the processes required in Policy ER 2.1.10 would ensure that potential significant impacts from the proposed project on nesting migratory birds would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

   The Master EIR analyzed potential impacts to special-status species from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, for which redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), CEQA, and the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (as applicable), as well as implementation of 2035 General Plan goals and policies discussed above would minimize potential direct and indirect impacts on special-status species and create off-site populations or provide habitat on mitigation sites to demonstrate that development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would not reduce special-status species populations below self-sustaining levels. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

b. No wetland, riparian, aquatic, or other sensitive natural habitat would be affected by the proposed project as none of these special-status habitats exist on the site or would be affected offsite. Therefore, **no impact** on natural communities would occur.

c. No state or federally protected wetlands would be affected by the proposed project since none occur within the project site. Therefore, **no impact** on federally protected wetlands and other waters of the U.S. would occur.

d. No native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species would be impacted by the proposed project since no habitat for these species occurs within the project site. Therefore, **no impact** on native resident or migratory fish or wildlife would occur.

e. The proposed project would not include the removal of trees protected under the City Tree Ordinance or street trees. There are no mature trees on the site that could be impacted by project construction or operations. Therefore, there would be **no impact** from the proposed project that would conflict with the City's tree preservation policy, tree protection ordinances, or other policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan for this area, therefore no conflict with such plans would occur under the proposed project and **no impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would have no impact to aquatic species or habitat, or riparian habitat. The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to other biological resource impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), 2018. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Special Status Species Occurrences on the Sacramento East and 8 Surrounding Quadrangles. Accessed August 20, 2018.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS), 2018. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-03). California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, CA. Available: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org. Accessed August 20, 2018.

City of Sacramento, 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan.

City of Sacramento, 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. List of Threatened and Endangered Species that may occur in your Proposed Project Location, and/or may be Affected by your Proposed Project. Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC). Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2018-SLI-3015. Event Code: 08ESMF00-2018-E-08976. Available: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/. Accessed August 20, 2018.

V. Cultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*No Impact*	*Analyzed in Prior EIR*	*Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies*
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

There are no existing buildings on the project site; there would be no impacts to historical architectural resources as a result of the proposed project.

The 2035 General Plan Update Master EIR (Master EIR) analyzed impacts of potential projects to archaeological resources in the Policy Area, which includes the project site. The following is an excerpt from the Cultural Resources section of the Master EIR that discussed the general sensitivity of Sacramento for archaeological resources.

> The City of Sacramento and the surrounding area have had a long cultural history and 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 BR [Background Report], are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses. The proposed land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and, therefore, impacts on sensitive prehistoric resources. However, high sensitivity areas can be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today, and recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the entire 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.

ESA completed a records search that included the project site at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at Sacramento State University in April 2018. There are no previously recorded prehistoric

or historic-era archaeological resources within the project site or within a ½-mile. The nearest prehistoric resources are a series of sites located at the edge of a former slough on the American River, approximately 2.5 miles west of the project site. The nearest historic-era archaeological resources are in the downtown area and consist of artifact-filled privies associated with early American use and occupation of Sacramento.

Per the City's Master EIR (Section 4.5, Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources), the City of Sacramento is not highly sensitive for paleontological resources due to the absence of fossil-bearing soils and rock formations. Sediments within the project area are principally Holocene alluvium to substantial depth, and are not considered sensitive for paleontological resources.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to cultural resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, including human remains, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource; or
- Adversely affect tribal cultural resources

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth-Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on cultural resources (see Master EIR Chapter 4.4 and Appendix C – Background Report, B. Cultural Resources Appendix). The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historical resources and archaeological resources. The Cultural Resources Appendix included the development of context statements for four topics: Railroads; Agricultural Industry; World War II, Transportation, and Redevelopment; and State Government.

The proposed 2035 General Plan identified policies that would work to identify and protect archaeological resources along with other federal and state regulations, which could result in the preservation of historic-era and prehistoric archaeological resources. Policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 in the proposed 2035 General Plan would protect archaeological resources by requiring surveys, research, and testing prior to excavation in high-sensitivity areas where there is no known previous disturbance of soils at the levels of the proposed excavation, proper handling of discovered resources, and enforcement of applicable laws and regulations.

The Master EIR indicates that feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available and that protection of all important archaeological resources from damage or destruction cannot be assured. Therefore, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. There are no historical architectural resources in the project site. No additional consideration of architectural resources is necessary for the proposed project and there would be **no impact**.

b. Potential impacts to archaeological resources were disclosed and evaluated in the Master EIR (pages 4.4-8 through 4.4-9). As discussed in the Master EIR, the growth projected to occur within the city would occur both through infill development and build out of currently undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas. Increased maximum density allowances in the urban area could result in development that could damage prehistoric- and historic-period archaeological resources. The 2035 General Plan contains policies that would work to identify and protect archaeological resources along with other federal and state regulations, which could result in the preservation of historic and prehistoric archeological resources. Policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 in the 2035 General Plan would protect archaeological resources by requiring proper handling of discovered resources, and enforcement of applicable laws and regulations. The project site is not located in an area identified as high or moderate sensitivity for the occurrence of archaeological resources, as defined in the 2035 General Plan Background Report (Master EIR, Appendix C, Figure 6.4-1). No prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources have been recorded within the project site and, based on the records search and Master EIR, Appendix C. Background Report, there is a low potential to uncover archaeological resource in the vicinity of the project site. However, while unlikely, there is the potential to uncover previously undocumented archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. Implementation of policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 of the 2035 General Plan would ensure that any previously undocumented archaeological resources, unearthed during project activities, would be appropriately handled so as to minimize impacts to those resources. Thus, implementation of existing city policy would be sufficient to offset potential adverse impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources.

No new information about archaeological resources has been discovered regarding the project site. There would be no new impacts under the proposal project, and the potential effects of the proposed project on archaeological resources were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

c. Potential impacts to human remains were disclosed and evaluated in the Master EIR (Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, specifically Impact 4.4-2). Compliance with existing law, including but not limited to California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054, would protect human burial remains. PRC section 5097.98 also addresses the disposition of Native American burials, protects such remains, and establishes the Native American Heritage Commission to resolve any related disputes. There is no indication that the project site has been used for human burial purposes in the past however there is the remote possibility that human remains could be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. No new information about human remains has been discovered regarding the project site. There would be no new impacts under the proposal project, and the potential effects of the proposed project on human remains were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to cultural resource impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento, 2015. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Certified March 3, 2015.

VI. Energy

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
ENERGY — Would the project:					
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is responsible for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical power to its 900 square mile service area, which includes most of Sacramento County and a small portion of Placer County. SMUD is a publicly-owned utility governed by a board of seven directors that make policy decisions and appoint the general manager, the individual responsible for the District's operations. SMUD also has arrangements with the California Independent System Operator (ISO), Western Systems Power Pool and Northern California Power Pool to purchase and sell short-term power. SMUD buys and sells energy and capacity on a short-term basis to meet load requirements and reduce costs. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) provides natural gas service to residents and businesses within the city.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Section 4.11.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to electricity and natural gas usage in the General Plan Policy Area. Implementation of identified policies in the 2035 General Plan was determined to reduce all these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Standards and incentives related to energy-efficiency proposed by Policies U 6.1.10 through U 6.1.13 would have a lasting positive effect on the cumulative impacts in the Policy Area. Policies U 6.1.6 through U 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would help reduce the cumulative impacts associated with non-renewable energy sources. The City specifically considers long-term impacts through General Plan Policy U 6.1.5, which would allow the City to work closely with utility providers and industries during future development to promote and advance new energy conservation technologies.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to energy resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A

significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards related to an increase in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy, resulting in a substantial increase in energy consumption or require the construction of new energy facilities.

Discussion

a–b. Structures built as part of the proposed 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 2035 General Plan includes Policies U 6.1.9 through U 6.1.16 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.

General Plan Policies U 6.1.6 through U 6.1.8 focus on promoting the use of renewable resources, which would reduce cumulative impacts associated with use of non-renewable energy sources. In addition, General Plan Policies U 6.1.10 and U 6.1.13 call for the City to work closely with utility providers and industries to promote new energy conservation technologies. General Plan Policy ER 6.1.2 requires the City to review development projects to ensure that project incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions. Implementation of these policies would result in a net decrease in energy consumption.

The Master EIR evaluated the potential impacts on energy use associated with buildout and densification of the city and concluded that the effects would be less than significant (see Master EIR Impact 4.11-6, pages 4.11-23 through 4.11-24).Impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project were identified and **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measure

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to energy use impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. March 3, 2015.

VII. Geology and Soils

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:					
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located within the Sacramento Valley, and lies centrally in the Great Valley geomorphic province of California. The Sacramento Valley forms the northern third of the Great Valley, which fills a northwest-trending structural depression bounded on the west by the Great Valley Fault Zone and the northern Coast Range, and to the east by the northern Sierra Nevada and the Foothills Fault Zone. Most of the surface of the Great Valley is covered with Holocene and Pleistocene-age alluvial soils, primarily composed of sediments from the Sierra Nevada and the Coast Ranges, which were carried by water and deposited on the valley floor.

Siltstone, claystone, and sandstone are the primary types of sedimentary deposits. Older Tertiary Cenozoic deposits underlie the Quaternary alluvial soils.[18]

Within the City of Sacramento and the Sacramento region, there are no known active faults. However, significant earthquakes have occurred on previously undetected faults. The City of Sacramento's topography is relatively flat, the City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the City is not located in the immediate vicinity of an active fault.[19] The greatest earthquake threat to the city comes from earthquakes along Northern California's major faults, which are the San Andreas, Calaveras, and Hayward faults. Ground shaking on any of these faults could cause shaking within the City to an intensity of 5 to 6 moment magnitude. Sacramento's seismic ground-shaking hazard is low, ranking among the lowest in the state. The city is in Seismic Zone 3. Accordingly, any future development, rehabilitation, reuse, or possible change of use of a structure would be required to comply with all design standards applicable to Seismic Zone 3.[20]

Because the city is flat, slope stability, landslide, and erosion hazards do not present substantial hazards to people and property. Site-specific effects of erosion are generally limited to construction, when stormwater runoff can carry sediment into local waterways or fugitive dust emissions.[21]

Liquefaction

Liquefaction is a soil strength and stiffness loss phenomenon that typically occurs in loose, saturated cohesionless sands or alluvial soils as a result of strong ground shaking during a seismic event. The potential for liquefaction at a specific site is usually determined based on the results of the underlain soil composition and groundwater conditions beneath the site. Liquefaction susceptibility decreases with the depth of the water table and the age, cementation, and compactness of the sediments.[22] Some areas in the City of Sacramento would be susceptible to liquefaction events, based on those factors, including the Central City, Pocket, and North and South Natomas Community Plan areas. The proposed project is not located within those areas and is not located within a State Designated Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction.[23]

Project Area Geology

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the entire project site is made up of Urban land (Map Unit

18 City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report*. Adopted March 3, 2015. Page 7-1.

19 California Department of Conservation, 2018. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Map. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed July 5, 2018.

20 City of Sacramento 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. Page 4.5-1.

21 City of Sacramento 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. Page 4.5-1.

22 City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report*. Adopted March 3, 2015. Page 7-1.

23 California Department of Conservation, 2018. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Map. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed July 5, 2018.

Symbol 227). No unique geologic or physical features are located on or adjacent to the project site.[24]

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to geology and soils are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards related to geologic or seismic hazards, if it would:

- Allow development that could result in substantial soil erosion; or
- Introduce either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 4.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, and existing mineral resources in the General Plan Policy Area. Implementation of identified policies in the 2035 General Plan was determined to reduce all impacts to a less than significant level. General Plan Policies EC 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 require the City to keep up-to-date records of seismic conditions, implement and enforce the most current building standards, and continue to require that site-specific geotechnical analyses be prepared for projects within the City and that report recommendations are implemented. These policies protect City residents and structures from seismic hazards.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–e. The City of Sacramento's topography is relatively flat, the City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the City is not located in the immediate vicinity of an active fault. However, the 2035 General Plan indicates that groundshaking could occur periodically in Sacramento as a result of distant earthquakes. The 2035 General Plan Master EIR (page 4.5-4) further states that the earthquake resistance of any building is dependent on an interaction of seismic frequency, intensity, and duration with the structure's height, condition, and construction materials. Although the project site is

[24] United States Department of Agriculture, 2018. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Soils Report for Sacramento County, California. Available: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed June 5, 2018.

not located near any active or potentially active faults, strong groundshaking could occur at the project site during a major earthquake on any of the major regional faults.

According to the California Geological Survey and the USGS, active faults are not mapped across the project site, nor is the project site located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Special Study Zone. The nearest fault to the project site is located approximately 30 miles to the northwest. The intensity of ground shaking caused by an earthquake at the nearest active fault is not expected to cause substantial damage to the project site, according to the Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California.

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations). The CBSC is based on the federal Uniform Building Code (UBC) but is more detailed and stringent than the federal UBC. Specific minimum seismic safety requirements are set forth in Chapter 23 of the CBSC. California Health and Safety Code Section 19100 et seq. requires buildings to be designed to resist stresses produced by lateral forces caused by earthquakes. Earthquake resistant design and materials are required to meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the CBSC Seismic Risk Zone 3 improvements. The proposed project would be required to comply with CBSC requirements and the City's 2035 General Plan and Master EIR, which require project applicants to prepare site-specific geotechnical evaluations and conformance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

Construction activities would involve building demolition and excavating, filling, moving, grading, and temporarily stockpiling soils onsite, which would expose site soils to erosion from wind and surface water runoff. The City has adopted standard measures to control erosion and sediment during construction and all projects in the City are required to comply with the City's Standard Construction Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control. The proposed project would comply with the City's standards set forth in the "Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control." The project would also comply with the City's grading ordinance (Chapter 15.88 of Sacramento City Code) which specifies construction standards to minimize erosion and runoff.

Because the proposed project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local construction standards, it would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death.

The proposed project is required to conform to 2035 General Plan policy EC 1.1.2, which would require that the project site be subject to a geotechnical investigation, conducted by a qualified expert and for project design to conform to CBC and various design standards. As described in the Master EIR (pages 4.5-4 through 4.5-6), the City would require that report recommendations be implemented. Implementation of the recommendations of a geotechnical investigation for the project site would ensure

impacts related to geological or seismic hazards would be minimal. Analysis in the Master EIR (pages 4.5-4 through 4.5-6) determined that buildout of the 2035 General Plan, under which the proposed project is an assumed project, would have less-than-significant impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards. The impacts under the proposal project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

f. Potential impacts to paleontological resources were disclosed and evaluated in the Master EIR (Section 4.5, Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources, specifically Impact 4.5-5). As described in the Master EIR (page 4.5-7), the city is not considered sensitive for paleontological resources and the likelihood of finding something would be very low, although ground-disturbing activities in fossil-bearing soils and rock formations have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources that may be present below the ground surface. Implementation of Policy HCR 2.1.16 of the 2035 General Plan would require the City to identify and protect paleontological resources in compliance with accepted protocols. Specifically, Implementation Program 13 requires amendment of the Sacramento Code to require discovery procedures for paleontological resources found during grading, excavation, or construction. These procedures include protocols and criteria for qualifications of personnel, and for survey, research, testing, training, monitoring, cessation and resumption of construction, identification, evaluation, and reporting, as well as compliance with recommendations to address any significant adverse effects where determined by the City to be feasible. The City of Sacramento is not highly sensitive for paleontological resources due to the absence of fossil-bearing soils and rock formations. Proposed project ground-disturbing activities would all occur in Holocene alluvium, which is not considered sensitive for paleontological resources. No new information about paleontological resources has been discovered regarding the project site. There would be no new impacts under the proposal project, and the potential effects of the proposed project on human remains were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to geology, soils, and seismicity impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

California Department of Conservation, 2018. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Map. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed July 5, 2018.

City of Sacramento 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Page 4.5-1. Certified March 3, 2015.

City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report*. Adopted March 3, 2015. Page 7-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, 2018. Natural Resources Conservation Service. *Soils Report for Sacramento County, California*. Available: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed June 5, 2018.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases or GHGs. While GHGs allow sunlight to enter the atmosphere, they trap a portion of the outward-bound infrared radiation, thereby warming the atmospheric air. The process is similar to the effect greenhouses have in raising the internal temperature, hence the name GHGs. Both natural processes and human activities emit GHGs. The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the Earth's temperature; however, emissions from human activities such as fossil fuel-based electricity production and the use of motor vehicles have elevated the concentration of GHGs in the atmosphere. This accumulation of GHGs has contributed to an increase in the temperature of the Earth's atmosphere and has contributed to global climate change. Global climate change is a change in the average weather on earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature.

Although there is disagreement as to the rate of global climate change and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most in the scientific community agree that there is a direct link between increased emissions of GHGs and long term global temperature increases.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). CO_2 is the most common reference gas for climate change. CO_2 accounts for approximately 85 percent of total human activity-generated GHG emissions. Emissions of other GHGs, such as methane and nitrous oxide, have also increased due to human activities and account for almost 14 percent of total GHG emissions. Each of these gases however contributes to global warming at a different relative rate. Methane has a global warming potential 23 times that of carbon dioxide, while the global warming potential of nitrous oxide is 296 times that of the same amount of carbon dioxide. To account for these differences in warming potential of different GHGs, estimates of GHG emissions are often quantified and described in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e). Large emission sources are reported in million metric tons of CO_2e.[25]

[25] The term metric ton is commonly used in the US to refer to the metric system unit, tonne, which is defined as a mass equal to 1,000 kilograms. A metric ton is approximately 1.1 short tons and approximately 2,204.6 pounds.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32

In 2006, the State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), which established a goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 set a mid-term GHG emissions reduction target, which seeks to move California toward achieving an even more aggressive, long-term reduction goal. Executive Order S-3-05, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2005, directed California to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As part of its implementation of AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified local governments as key partners in achieving statewide GHG emissions reduction targets and goals. Since 2006 communities throughout California have been preparing climate action plans to do their part to help meet State GHG emissions reduction targets.

Sacramento Climate Action Plan

The Sacramento Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted February 14, 2012. It identified how the City and broader community can reduce Sacramento's GHGs. The CAP included GHG reduction targets, strategies, and specific actions. It also identified strategies and specific actions which Sacramento can take to adapt to the effects of climate change. The Sacramento Climate Action Plan was incorporated into the 2035 General Plan as CAP policies and adopted on March 3, 2015.

City of Sacramento GHG Emissions Inventory

Based on the 2011 GHG emissions inventory for the City of Sacramento, the transportation sector represents the largest source of GHG emissions, accounting for 52.2 percent of the City's annual emissions of 3.85 million metric tons of CO_2e. Electricity and natural gas used to operate, heat, and cool commercial, industrial, and residential buildings accounted for another 38.2 percent of annual CO_2e emissions. The other CO_2e emission sectors included in the inventory (with percent contributions reported in parentheses) were waste (8.2 percent), wastewater treatment (0.5 percent), water consumption (0.3 percent) and industrial specific sources (0.5 percent).

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate impacts of the project's GHG emissions are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, Sacramento Municipal Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) guidance, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for the purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards related to GHG emissions.

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would:

- generate GHG emissions that would have a substantial adverse impact on the environment; or

- conflict with an applicable plan adopted for the reduction of GHG emissions.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Development that would occur under the General Plan would result in construction- and operation- related GHG emissions that would contribute to climate change on a cumulative basis (see Master EIR Chapter 4.14). While detailed construction information for individual projects was unknown at the time of the analysis, the Master EIR assumed that construction would typically involve use of heavy-duty equipment, construction worker commute trips, material deliveries, and vendor trips. These activities would result in GHG emissions limited in duration for any given project, but when taken together over buildout of the General Plan, could be considerable. Long-term operational sources of GHG emissions associated with the General Plan would include mobile sources (e.g., vehicle exhaust), energy consumption (e.g., electricity and natural gas), solid waste (e.g., emissions that would occur at a landfill associated with solid waste decomposition), wastewater treatment, and water consumption (e.g., electricity used to deliver and treat water consumed by customers in the city).

Policies in the General Plan that would reduce construction-related GHG emissions from development include:

- Policy ER 6.1.2: New Development. The City shall review proposed development projects to ensure projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) through project design.

- Policy ER 6.1.11: Coordination with SMAQMD. The City shall coordinate with SMAQMD to ensure projects incorporate feasible mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions and air pollution if not already provided for through project design.

- Policy ER 6.1.15: Preference for Reduced-Emission Equipment. The City shall give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment for City construction projects and contracts for services (e.g., garbage collection), as well as businesses that practice sustainable operations.

These policies would result in projects incorporating feasible best practices for reducing GHG emissions from construction activities. These policies also accommodate advances in low-emission equipment, alternative fuels, and other technologies that are not widely-available or cost-effective today such that they may be implemented in the future. The General Plan contains a comprehensive strategy that achieves a community-wide GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, and sets the City on course towards reducing ongoing GHG emissions in the future through 2035 and 2050. Because GHG emissions from vehicles are one of the largest sources of GHG emissions in the city, VMT is an important metric to help measure progress toward reducing GHG emissions. VMT/capita is expected to decline by about seven percent in the city through the General Plan 2035 buildout horizon, which means that

vehicle trips are expected to get shorter and shift to non- vehicle travel modes (e.g., transit, walking, and bicycling).

The Master EIR includes discussion of the 2035 General Plan consistency with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), which was developed pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 375. California metropolitan planning organizations are directed by SB 375 to coordinate regional transportation and land use planning with the goal of VMT and associated GHG reductions. The SCS is a set of land use, housing, and transportation strategies that, if implemented, would allow the region to meet its GHG emissions reduction targets. The 2035 General Plan assumed slightly less growth than the City's 2030 General Plan, which was in place at the time SACOG prepared the MTP/SCS. Therefore, the City's 2035 General Plan is consistent with the assumptions in the MTP/SCS, and the Master EIR concluded that the impacts of development associated with buildout of the 2035 General Plan and its consistency with the MTP/SCS would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–b. Land use development projects such as the proposed project typically include the following sources of GHG emissions:

- Construction activities that result in exhaust emissions of GHGs from fuel combustion for mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips;
- Motor vehicle trips generated by the particular land use (i.e. vehicles arriving and leaving the project site), primarily those by residents and visitors;
- Onsite fuel combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, and fireplaces/stoves; and
- Offsite emissions at utility providers associated with the project's demand for electricity, water conveyance, and wastewater processing.

While the SMAQMD does provide guidance for addressing the GHG emissions associated with individual development projects, it generally agrees that GHG emissions are best analyzed and mitigated at the program level, especially in jurisdictions such as the City of Sacramento where program level GHG analyses has been conducted and a

GHG reduction plan or climate action plan has been adopted.[26] Therefore, the analysis of whether the proposed project would generate GHG emissions that would have a substantial adverse impact on the environment is also included in the discussion for Issue b), below, using consistency of the project with the Sacramento Clean Air Plan policies incorporated into the 2035 General Plan as the criterion.

All development projects in the City envisioned under the 2035 General Plan would be subject to policies in the General Plan that aim to reduce GHG emissions. Projects would be required to incorporate feasible best management practices or conditions of approval to comply with these policies. These policies also accommodate advances in low-emission equipment, alternative fuels, and other technologies that are not widely-available or cost-effective today such that they may be implemented in the future.

The 2035 General Plan incorporated the City's 2012 Climate Action Plan strategies, measures, and actions that reduce GHG emissions into appropriate elements of the General Plan. Appendix B of the General Plan is entitled, "Climate Action Plan Policies and Programs." Most of the listed items are "supporting," which, in this context, means that the implementation of these policies or programs would *support* the City's overall efforts to reduce local sources of GHG emissions. Those policies that are relevant to the proposed project and for which the City has estimated the effectiveness for 2020 and 2035 emission reduction are presented and discussed below.

- Policy LU 2.6.6 Efficiency through Density. The City shall support an overall increase in average residential densities throughout the City consistent with the adopted General Plan Land Use & Urban Form Diagram, as new housing types shift from lower-density, large lot developments to higher-density, small lot and multifamily developments as a means to increase energy efficiency, conserve water, and reduce waste.

The proposed project would construct a multi-family housing development with a development density of approximately 31 units per acre, consistent with the required density of the Urban Center High land use designation. The project would create a high density infill housing project along a major transit corridor, providing nearby access to various modes of public transit.

- Policy M 2.1.1 Pedestrian Master Plan. The City shall maintain and implement a Pedestrian Master Plan that carries out the goals and policies of the General Plan. All new development shall be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Pedestrian Master Plan.

The proposed project would construct connections with existing sidewalks along Cormorant Way and Royale Road. The proposed project would construct driveways with curb ramps along Sacramento Inn Way and the proposed spine roadway, which would preserve the existing Basic level of pedestrian improvements as required by the

26 SMAQMD, *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County*, December 2009.

Pedestrian Master Plan. In addition, the proposed project would install a pedestrian (sidewalk) system between the project site and the D.W. Babcock Elementary School as a condition of approval. Based on this evaluation, the proposed project's pedestrian amenities would meet the City of Sacramento's Consistency Checklist for pedestrian facilities.

The proposed project would make the area more attractive and accessible to pedestrians as there would be a way to access the project site via improved sidewalks. The proposed improvements would be context-sensitive to the neighborhood setting and proximity to surrounding amenities such as the Arden Fair Mall. The desired outcome is a streetscape that provides safe pedestrian facilities including separated sidewalks, crosswalk markings, and new onsite bicycle facilities.

- Policy M 4.3.2 Efficiency through Density. Consistent with the Roadway Network and Street Typology policies in this General Plan and Goal M 4.3, the City shall use traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds and volumes while also encouraging walking and bicycling. Specific measures may include, but are not limited to, marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median islands, tight corner radii, roundabouts, traffic circles, on-street parking, planter strips with street trees, chicanes/chokers, and geometric design features. (CAP Action 2.1.1)

The proposed project would maintain pedestrian access in the area and construct traffic calming measures in the adjacent neighborhood to slow traffic from the proposed project and nearby uses. Creation of defined roadway edges along Sacramento Inn Way, Cormorant Way, Royale Road, and the proposed internal spine roadway would also signal to drivers that there is an increased level of pedestrian activity than what currently exists and there are dedicated spaces for pedestrians and vehicles. This separation between mode types would slow traffic by signaling to drivers that they should expect pedestrians to be present, thereby increasing safety.

- Program: 11 The City shall implement the Bikeway Master Plan by (1) increasing, or causing to be increased the amount of secure bicycle parking within the City by 50 locations annually, and (2) expanding the existing bikeway system by 5 percent annually. (CAP Action 2.3.1)

The proposed project would include on-site bike storage for use by project residents and visitors. The proposed project would preserve the Class III bike lanes and pedestrian sidewalks exist along Arden Way, which provide access to the proposed project site. While striped bike lanes do not exist along Arden Way or nearby neighborhood roadways, the proposed project would not inhibit the use of those streets for bicycle travel.

- Program: 14 The City shall work with Sacramento RT and community partners to increase public transit service above and beyond what is already planned in the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan by 5 percent in 2020 and 10 percent in 2030. (CAP Action 2.4.1)

The proposed project would place approximately 1,932 new residents in an area that presently does not have residential uses, thereby increasing the potential ridership on transit. The project site is close to the Arden Fair bus transit station.

- Policy U 2.1.10 Water Conservation Standards. The City shall achieve a 20 percent reduction in per-capita water use by 2020 consistent with the State's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan (California Water Resources Control Board, 2010).

The proposed project would comply with the minimum CALGreen Tier 1 Water Efficiency Measures as a condition of approval, thereby decreasing water usage and increasing efficiency.

The proposed project is consistent with each applicable General Plan policy and implementation program that has GHG emissions reductions calculated as a part of the 2035 General Plan and that would relevant to the proposed action.

In 2012, the City of Sacramento adopted a community wide Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP outlines multiple initiatives intended to help the City achieve its overall goals of reducing community-wide emissions by 15% below 2005 levels by 2020, 38% below 2005 levels by 2030, and 83% below 2005 levels by 2050. Included in the CAP are a comprehensive set of strategies, measures and implementing actions to achieve the 2020 GHG reduction target. These GHG reduction measures and actions apply to both existing sources within the City as of the 2005 baseline and projected emissions from new growth and development anticipated in the 2035 General Plan. In addition, the CAP identifies potentially adverse physical effects related to climate change on the community and includes specific adaptation measures to address and mitigate such effects.

The City has developed a Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist for use in determining the consistency of proposed projects with the CAP.[27] The CAP Consistency Review Checklist includes six criteria that a project must be evaluated against, as shown in **Table 8-1**. Projects that are consistent with each of the six criteria are considered consistent with Sacramento's CAP and would not have a significant GHG impact.

TABLE 8-1
CITY OF SACRAMENTO CAP CONSISTENCY REVIEW CHECKLIST

	City of Sacramento Consistency Review Checklist Questions
1.	Is the proposed project substantially consistent with the land use and urban form designation, allowable floor area ratio (FAR) and/or density standards in the City's 2035 General Plan?
2.	Would the project incorporate traffic calming measures?
3.	Would the project incorporate pedestrian facilities and connections to public transportation consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan?

27 City of Sacramento, *Climate Action Plan – Consistency Review Checklist*. Available: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/CAP-Consistency-Checklist_2030-Gen-Plan-6-19-15.pdf?la=en.

4.	Would the project incorporate bicycle facilities consistent with the City's Bikeway Master Plan and meet or exceed minimum standards for bicycle facilities in the Zone Code and CALGreen?
5.	Would the project include on-site renewable energy systems (e.g., solar photovoltaic, solar water heating, etc.) that would generate at least 15% of the project's total energy demand?
6.	Would the project comply with minimum CALGreen Tier 1 water efficiency standards?

The following discussion evaluates the proposed project for each of these six criteria.

1. Is the proposed project substantially consistent with the City's over-all goals for land use and urban form, allowable floor area ratio (FAR) and/or density standards in the City's 2035 General Plan?

The CAP Consistency Review Checklist states that the proposed project must be consistent with the 2035 General Plan Land Use and Urban Form Designations and Development Standards. The proposed project site is designated as Urban Center High in the City's 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram. The proposed project would develop the project site in a manner that is consistent with the Urban Center High land use designation in the City's 2035 General Plan.

2. Would the proposed project include traffic-calming measures?

The proposed project would include traffic-calming measures in the form of speed tables in the residential roadways to the northeast of the project site.

3. Would the proposed project incorporate pedestrian facilities and connections to public transportation consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan?

The level of pedestrian improvements necessary to determine Pedestrian Master Plan and thus CAP consistency is measured according to the "Basic, Upgrade, or Premium" categories defined in Appendix A to the Pedestrian Master Plan. The differences between these three categories are based on several criteria, including project location, surrounding land uses, and proximity to transit.

The proposed project would develop a network of pedestrian facilities that would provide multiple pedestrian access points to and from each of the two standalone apartment communities at vehicle driveway locations and additional access points at non-vehicle pedestrian entry/exit points. The pedestrian network would provide for internal circulation within the gated perimeters of each standalone community and sidewalk improvements along both sides of the proposed internal spine project roadway, the east side of Sacramento Inn Way, the south side of Cormorant Way, and the west side of Royale Way. Internal pedestrian facilities would include a continuation of sidewalks along internal private streets, including crosswalks and other required safety markings, and pedestrian pathways between the residential structures, where structures are not separated by private drives. In addition, the proposed project would install a pedestrian (sidewalk) system between the project site and the D.W. Babcock Elementary School as a condition of approval.

These pedestrian amenities proposed by the project would meet the City of Sacramento's Consistency Checklist for pedestrian facilities.

4. Would the proposed project incorporate bicycle facilities consistent with the City's Bikeway Master Plan, and meet or exceed minimum standards for bicycle facilities in the Zoning Code and CALGreen?

Currently bicycle facilities in the project vicinity include Class III bicycle lanes along Arden Way and nearby Streets, which are unstriped lanes that allow for shared vehicle and bicycle travel in accordance with vehicle travel laws. The proposed project would include the construction of at least 53 short term bicycle parking stalls. The project would also provide multiple bicycle access points to and from the site and the project's spine roadway will provide an additional route of travel for bicycle use through the project site. Further, as a condition of approval, the proposed project would install an on-street bicycle route between the project site, D.W. Babcock Elementary School, and existing bike lanes on El Camino Avenue.

The City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan (Bicycle Master Plan) identifies existing bicycle facilities throughout the City and identifies proposed improvements to the City's bicycle network. The Bicycle Master Plan identifies proposed on-street bicycle facilities in the residential neighborhood and along Ethan Way to the northeast of the project site.[28] The proposed project would not be constructed along existing or planned bicycle facilities and, as such, would not be anticipated to impact these existing or proposed facilities. For this reason, the proposed project would not conflict with the implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan.

The proposed project would incorporate off-street bicycle parking consistent with the Bikeway Master Plan, Zoning Code, and CALGreen standards. Since the project site would be accessible by the on-street Class III bikeways, the proposed project would be consistent with the Bikeway Master Plan and meets the CAP Consistency Checklist for bicycle facilities.

5. For residential projects of 10 or more units, commercial projects greater than 25,000 square feet, or industrial projects greater than 100,000 square feet, would the project include on-site renewable energy systems (e.g., photovoltaic systems) that would generate at least a minimum of 15% of the project's total energy demand on-site?

The proposed project would not generate 15 percent of its energy demand on-site. However, the proposed project would be designed in compliance with the 2016 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, that became effective January 1, 2017.

The CAP Consistency Review Checklist was based on improving efficiency by 30 percent above the requirements of the 2008 Title 24 standards (effective January 1, 2010). Since setting that standard, the State has updated the Building Energy Efficiency

[28] City of Sacramento, 2016. *City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan*. August 16, 2016. Page 42.

Standards on an approximate three-year cycle, with each cycle resulting in increasingly stringent energy requirements. For example, the 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards went into effect on July 1, 2014 and the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards went into effect on January 1, 2017. The California Energy Commission has stated that the 2013 Title 24 standards would use 25 percent less energy for lighting, heating, cooling, ventilation, and water heating than the Title 24 standards used for the City's CAP (2008 Title 24 standards), and that residential buildings built to the 2016 standards will use about 28 percent less energy for lighting, heating, cooling, ventilation and water heating than those built to the 2013 standards. Energy savings for non-residential buildings are comparable. These energy improvements enacted by the State and applicable to each building constructed in the community would satisfy the reduction requirements that are identified in the City's CAP. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the CAP Consistency Checklist.

California has developed a goal of zero net energy (ZNE) use in all new homes by 2020 and commercial buildings by 2030.[29] The ZNE goal means new buildings must use a combination of improved efficiency and distributed renewable energy generation to meet 100 percent of their annual energy needs. The 2019 Title 24 energy standards are expected to take the final step to achieve ZNE for newly constructed residential buildings throughout California. The proposed residential dwelling units will be built to 2019 Title 24 energy standards, which for residential units would clearly be more efficient than the 2016 Title 24 energy standards. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

6. Would the proposed project (if constructed on or after January 1, 2014) comply with minimum CALGREEN Tier 1 water efficiency standards?

The proposed project would include a commitment to a series of water conserving landscape requirements that involve the use of drought-resistant landscaping and water-conserving irrigation methods to reduce water waste. The proposed project would comply with the minimum CALGreen Tier 1 Water Efficiency Measures as a condition of approval, and would therefore be consistent with the CAP.

Because the Master EIR concluded that development associated with buildout of the General Plan would be less than significant based on consistency with the City's CAP policies and SACOG's MTP/SCS, and the proposed project was included in the anticipated growth under the General Plan, and is consistent with both the CAP and the MTP/SCS, the proposed projects impacts were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

[29] California Energy Commission, 2016. 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Building Energy Efficiency Standards Frequently Asked Questions. Available: www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2016standards/rulemaking/documents/2016_Building_Energy_Efficiency_Standards_FAQ.pdf.

Findings

The proposed project would not result in any impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions that were not identified and evaluated in a previous EIR.

References

City of Sacramento, 2015. *Climate Action Plan – Consistency Review Checklist*. Available: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/CAP-Consistency-Checklist_2030-Gen-Plan-6-19-15.pdf?la=en. Accessed May 3, 2018.

City of Sacramento, 2016. *City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan*. August 16, 2016. Page 42.

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

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
IV. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is within an urban setting. The project site is currently vacant with remaining foundational elements and paving from the previously demolished hotel and associated structures. A site-specific investigation for the presence of hazardous materials has not been conducted for the project site. Existing and prior uses on and adjacent to the project site may include or have included the use of hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

GeoTracker

GeoTracker is the State Water Resources Control Board's Internet-accessible database system used by the State Board, regional boards, and local agencies to track and archive compliance data

from authorized or unauthorized discharges of waste to land, or unauthorized releases of hazardous substances from underground storage tanks. This system consists of a relational database, on-line compliance reporting features, a geographical information system (GIS) interface and other features that are utilized by the State Board, regional boards, local agencies, regulated industry and the public to input, manage, or access compliance and regulatory tracking data. GeoTracker provides access to statewide environmental data and tracks regulatory data for Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) cleanup sites; Cleanup Program Sites (CPS; also known as Site Cleanups [SC] and formerly known as Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups [SLIC] sites); military sites (consisting of: Military UST sites; Military Privatized sites; and Military Cleanup sites [formerly known as DoD non UST]); land disposal sites (Landfills); permitted UST facilities; Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) sites; and agricultural Waivers Program (Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, ILRP) sites.

A search of GeoTracker records identified three cleanup sites within 1,000 feet of the project site. Each site is a LUST site for which the cleanup has been completed and the case has been closed.

LUST Cleanup Site
Fraga Forklift Sales (T0606700785)
1550 Silica Avenue, Sacramento, CA, 95815
RB Case #: 340950
Loc Case #: A351
Cleanup Status: Completed - Case Closed

LUST Cleanup Site
Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito & Vector Control District (SLT5S2513290)
El Camino Avenue and Business 80, Sacramento, CA 95815
RB Case #: SLT5S251
Cleanup Status: Completed - Case Closed

LUST Cleanup Site
Mosquito Abate District (T0606700297)
1650 Silica Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95815
RB Case #: 340366
Loc Case #: A260
Cleanup Status: Completed - Case Closed

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to hazards and hazardous materials are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards related to hazards or hazardous materials. For the purposes of this Infill Checklist, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response, and aircraft safety hazards (see Master EIR Chapter 4.6).

The Master EIR disclosed that implementation of the 2035 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 2035 General Plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. The Master EIR determined that policies included in the 2035 General Plan were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

General Plan Policy PHS 3.1.1 would require that buildings and sites under consideration for new development or redevelopment are investigated for the presence of hazardous materials prior to development activities. General Plan Policy PHS 3.1.2 requires that property owners of contaminated sites develop plans to investigate and manage hazardous material contamination to prevent risk to human health or the environment. The City also maintains a Multi-Hazard Emergency Response Plan to address hazardous materials spills as required by General Plan Policy PHS 4.1.1.

The Master EIR noted that routine use and transport of hazardous materials is regulated by a number of federal, state, and local regulations. Most household and general commercial uses of hazardous materials would be very minor and would not result in a substantial increase in the risk

of a hazardous materials incident. Potential incidents may include accidental spills or releases, intentional releases, and/or the release of hazardous materials during or following a natural disaster such as an earthquake or flood. To respond to these circumstances, Sacramento County has developed an Area Plan for Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents. The City of Sacramento Fire Department also has a hazardous materials incident response team, and works in cooperation with other regional and state agencies in the event of a major emergency.

Compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, along with the 2035 General Plan policies, was found to reduce the potential for exposure of construction workers and the general public to unusual or excessive risks related to hazardous materials during demolition or construction activities and throughout the life of the 2035 General Plan. The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2035 General Plan on hazards within the City was less than significant.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–d. A site-specific investigation for the presence of hazardous materials has not been conducted for the project site. Existing and prior uses on and adjacent to the project site may include or have included the use of hazardous materials, substances, or waste. In addition, construction activities on the project site would involve the transport and use of fuels, lubricants, paint, solvents, and other potentially hazardous materials to the project site during construction. Relatively small amounts of these commonly used hazardous substances would be used onsite for construction and equipment maintenance.

As discussed above, the Master EIR disclosed that implementation of the 2035 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 2035 General Plan (page 4.6-5). Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2035 General Plan (identified above) were determined to be effective in reducing identified impacts.

In addition, routine use and transport of hazardous materials is regulated by a number of federal, state, and local regulations. Most household and general commercial uses of hazardous materials would be very minor and would not result in a substantial increase in the risk of a hazardous materials incident. Potential incidents may include accidental spills or releases, intentional releases, and/or the release of hazardous materials during or following a natural disaster such as an earthquake or flood. To respond to these circumstances, Sacramento County has developed an Area Plan for Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents. The City of Sacramento Fire Department also has a hazardous materials incident response team, and works in cooperation with other regional and state agencies in the event of a major emergency.

The proposed project's required compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, along with the 2035 General Plan policies, would reduce the potential for exposure of construction workers and the general public to unusual or excessive risks related to hazardous materials during demolition or construction activities and throughout the life of the project.

As noted above, a site-specific investigation for the presence of hazardous materials has not been conducted for the project site. Because existing and prior uses on and adjacent to the project site may include or have included the use of hazardous materials, substances, or waste, impacts related to creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment are potentially significant. Conformance with Policy PHS 3.1.1 would require that sites under considerations for redevelopment be subject to a site-specific investigation for the presence of hazardous materials prior to development activities for the project site. Conformance with Policy PHS 3.1.1 would ensure that hazardous materials on the project site would be identified and subject to a treatment plan, prior to the commencement of demolition activities.

The Master EIR analyzed potential impacts to the public or the environment from exposure to hazards or hazardous materials, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that compliance with the applicable policies as well as implementation of 2035 General Plan goals and policies discussed above would minimize potential impacts from exposure to hazards or hazardous materials to less-than-significant levels. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and will comply with applicable General Plan policies. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

e. Sacramento McClellan Airport is the closest airport to the project site and is located approximately four miles northeast of the project site. Accordingly, the proposed project is not located within two miles of an airport, airstrip, or airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area or expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise. There would be **no impact** related to safety hazards or the exposure of excessive noise due to proximity of the proposed project to an airport or airstrip, as the proposed project is not proximal to either an airport or airstrip.

f. Sacramento 2035 General Plan Policy EC 2.1.23 requires the City to maintain, implement, update, and make available to the public the local Comprehensive Flood Management Plan, Emergency Plans, and Evacuation Plans, which address emergency preparedness, evacuation, hazardous materials, protection of critical facilities, development guidelines, and flood insurance outreach to better protect citizens in the event of a major flood event. Sacramento 2035 General Plan Policy PHS 4.1.2 requires

the City to plan for the continued functioning of critical facilities following a major seismic or geologic disaster to help prevent major problems during post-disaster response such as evacuations, rescues, large numbers of injuries, and major cleanup operations.

The proposed project would develop residential uses in an area assumed for development of residential uses the 2035 General Plan. The project would include more than 150 dwelling units and is therefore subject to the City's Site Plan and Design Review process pursuant to Chapter 17.808 of the City. The intent of the Site Plan and Design Review process is to (1) ensure that the development is consistent with applicable plans and design guidelines; (2) is high quality and compatible with surrounding development; (3) is supported by adequate circulation, utility, and related infrastructure; (4) is water and energy efficient; and (5) avoids environmental effects to the extent feasible. The aspects of design considered in the site plan and design review process include architectural design, site design, adequacy of streets and accessways for all modes of travel, energy consumption, protection of environmentally sensitive features, safety, noise, and other relevant considerations. Required compliance with the City's Site Plan and Design Review process would ensure that the proposed project is supported by adequate circulation and related infrastructure and is in compliance with adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans. The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts to response time anticipated to occur from buildout of the 2035 General Plan. The City determined that adequate emergency response times would be maintained throughout buildout of the 2035 General Plan. Local emergency response routes would be maintained during project construction and operation. For these reasons, buildout pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would have a less-than-significant impact related to the implementation of emergency response plans. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and will comply with applicable General Plan policies. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

g. The project site is within a fully urbanized area in the City of Sacramento that is not adjacent to or intermixed with wildlands. The proposed project would result in **no impact** related to exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to hazards or hazardous material impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

GeoTracker, 2018. Cleanup Sites Within a 1,000-Foot Radius of 1401 Arden Way, Sacramento, CA, USA. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=arden+fair+mall. Accessed June 29, 2018.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk or release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The currently vacant project site is located within an urban setting and is comprised of both impervious and pervious surfaces. Existing drainage lines run from west to east through the project site before discharging into the City Canal near the southeast corner.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) that delineate flood hazard zones for communities. The project site is located within an area designated as Zone X.[30] Areas within Zone X are considered by FEMA to be areas of

[30] City of Sacramento, 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft. August 2014. Page 7-19. Figure 7.2.

moderate hazard (100–500-year flood zone). FEMA does not have building regulations for development in areas designated Zone X and would not require mandatory flood insurance for structures in Zone X.

The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (RegionalSan) provides wastewater conveyance and treatment throughout Sacramento County, including the project site. The City has an agreement with the RegionalSan whereby the City can convey a maximum of 60 mgd to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) for secondary treatment prior to discharge to the Sacramento River. Flows conveyed by the City's wastewater systems are routed to the SRWTP for treatment and disposal via an interceptor system consisting of large diameter pipes and pump stations. The interceptor system and the SRWTP, located just south of the City limits, are owned and operated by the independent RegionalSan.

The Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP) outlines the priorities, key elements, strategies, and evaluation methods of the City's Stormwater Management program. The Program is based on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) municipal stormwater discharge permit. The comprehensive Program includes pollution reduction activities for construction sites, industrial sites, illegal discharges and illicit connections, new development, and municipal operations.

Sacramento City Code Section 13.08.145 addresses mitigation of drainage impacts and design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities. The code requires that when a property contributes drainage to the storm drain system or combined sewer system, all storm water and surface runoff drainage impacts resulting from the improvement or development must be fully mitigated to ensure that the improvement or development does not affect the function of the storm drain system or combined sewer system, and that there is no increase in flooding or in water surface elevation that adversely affects individuals, streets, structures, infrastructure, or property.

The Sewer Development Fee Fund is used to recover an appropriate share of the capital costs of the City's existing or newer system facilities. Revenues are generated from impact fees paid by developers and others whose projects add to the demand on the combined sewer collection systems. In order to connect with the RegionalSan wastewater conveyance and treatment system, developers must pay impact fees.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to hydrology and water quality are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, 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 Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- 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 proposed project 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 4.7 of the Master EIR (pages 4.7-1 – 4.7-18) 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 (Impact 4.7-1), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impact 4.7-3). Policies included in the 2035 General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation (General Plan Policies ER 1.1.2 and EC 2.1.1), comprehensive flood management (General Plan Policy EC 2.1.23), and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (General Plan Policy U 1.1.1) were identified that reduced all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–c. ***Construction***

Storm water runoff from the project site flows to the City's storm water drainage system. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would create the potential to degrade water quality from increased sedimentation and increased discharge (increased flow and volume of runoff) associated with storm water runoff. Disturbance of site soils would increase the potential for erosion from storm water. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted a statewide general NPDES permit for storm water discharges associated with construction activity. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2010-0014-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation.

The City's SQIP contains a Construction Element that guides in implementation of the NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. This General Construction Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP should contain a site map(s) which shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, storm water collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project. The SWPPP must list

BMPs the discharger will use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of those BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program; a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutants to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Section A of the Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP. Compliance with City requirements to protect storm water inlets would require the developer to implement BMPs such as the use of straw bales, sandbags, gravel traps, and filters; erosion control measures such as vegetation and physical stabilization; and sediment control measure such as fences, dams, barriers, berms, traps, and basins. City staff also inspect and enforce the erosion, sediment, and pollution control requirements in accordance with City codes (Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control ordinance). Because the proposed project would conform with City regulations and permit requirements and implement BMPs through conditions of approval, construction activities under the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to storm water absorption rates, discharges, flows, and water quality.

Operation

The discussion of Impact 4.7-2 in the Master EIR (pages 4.7-14–4.7-16) identified that development under the 2035 General Plan would result in new residential, commercial, recreation, and landscaping practices that would increase impervious surfaces within the Policy Area. New development would increase stormwater and non-stormwater runoff entering local streams, the Sacramento and American rivers, and the SRCSD compared to existing conditions, which could affect water quality by potentially increasing sediment and contaminant loads.

Because of the limited amount of remaining vacant land, the Master EIR concluded that much of the city's future growth would be in the form of infill and redevelopment. The proposed 2035 General Plan calls for future growth to be focused within the city's developed areas.

The Master EIR determined that future development in the city could have impacts on existing site infiltration rates, drainage patterns, or the rate of surface runoff. As future development occurs, projects would be evaluated based on their conformance with the proposed 2035 General Plan, the appropriate community plan, and established development regulations.

Runoff from urban development typically contains oils, grease, fuel, antifreeze, byproducts of combustion, such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and other metals, as well as nutrients from fertilizers and animal waste, sediment, pesticides, herbicides, and other pollutants. Sizable quantities of animal waste from pets (e.g., dogs, cats, and horses) contribute bacterial pollutants into surface waters. Precipitation during the early portion of the wet season conveys a majority of these pollutants in the stormwater runoff, resulting in short-term high pollutant concentrations in the initial wet weather runoff.

This initial runoff, containing peak pollutant levels, is referred to as the "first flush" of storm events.

The City operates under a Phase I NPDES permit for stormwater municipal discharges to surface waters (NPDES No. CAS0085324, Order R5-2016-0040). The permit requires that the City impose water quality and watershed protection measures for all development projects. The intent of the waste discharge requirements in the permit is to attain water quality standards and protection of beneficial uses consistent with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's (CVRWQCB) Basin Plan. The NPDES permit prohibits discharges from causing violations of applicable water quality standards or result in conditions that create a nuisance or water quality impairment in receiving waters. A key component of the NPDES permit is the implementation of the SQIP, which consists of six Minimum Control elements 1) public education and outreach, 2) commercial/industrial control, 3) detection and elimination of illicit discharges, 4) construction stormwater control, 5) post-construction stormwater control for new development and redevelopment 6) pollution prevention/good housekeeping for municipal operations). In addition, the City's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance and Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Code provide additional regulation and guidance to prevent degradation of water quality.

The City has identified a range of BMPs and measurable goals to address the stormwater discharges in the city. A key component of this compliance is implementation of the SQIP new development element that requires stormwater quality treatment and/or BMPs to be incorporated in the project design phase. Post-construction stormwater quality controls for new development require use of source control, runoff reduction, and treatment control measures set forth in the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region (latest edition). This includes use of regional water quality control features (e.g., detention basins) for large developments (over 20 acres), use of treatment-control measures, including swales, filter strips, media filters and infiltration, and housekeeping practices (e.g., spill prevention, proper storage measures and clean-up procedures).

Further, the Master EIR determined that General Plan Policies ER 1.1.3 through ER 1.1.10 would implement measures to reduce post-construction increases in runoff rates, maintain agreements for selected on-site stormwater quality facilities through the development permit process, reduce use of chemicals applied for landscape use, provide recycling programs and facilities to prevent unauthorized dumping, and provide watershed education to City staff. Implementation of General Plan Policies U1.1.1 through 1.1.5 requires that the City provides and maintains adequate stormwater drainage utility services. In addition, meeting these policies and the previous mentioned requirements would minimize the likelihood of urban pollutants in stormwater runoff from percolating into the soil and degrading groundwater.

The Master EIR stated that implementation of development proposed under the 2035 General Plan would improve and maintain stormwater protection measures through

maintenance of existing stormwater facilities, and implementation of new development requirements in the Policy Area to meet the City's water quality design criteria. Therefore, including all the requirements would help reduce the potential for sediments and pollutants from entering receiving waters and reduce impacts on water quality to less-than-significant levels.

The proposed project would incorporate LID measures as required for all projects above the impervious surface threshold applicable based upon land use, as described in the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region.[31] The existing project site is substantially covered with impervious surfaces. The proposed project would improve opportunities for onsite groundwater infiltration by inclusion of numerous open space areas (see Figure 4). The project would also include a stormwater retention area, allowing for additional groundwater infiltration, where the existing site drains directly into the City's stormwater infrastructure. In addition, project landscaping would include trees in vegetated areas, a common LID design method for improving groundwater infiltration.

The Master EIR analyzed potential impacts to the implementation of water quality standards, maintenance of groundwater supplies, drainage, or water quality, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that compliance with applicable 2035 General Plan policies, City regulations and permit requirements along with implementation of BMPs through conditions of approval, construction and operational activities pursuant to buildout of the 2035 General Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to storm water absorption rates, discharges, flows, and water quality. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

d. The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include 731 residential apartment units. Due to its inland location from the ocean and the absence of a large body of water such as a lake or reservoir in the local area, the proposed project site is not located within a tsunami or seiche zone. The proposed project site is located within Flood Zone X of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The project area designation under Flood Zone X is determined to be outside the area having a 0.2 percent chance of a flood. Based on this designation, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100 or 500-year storm events. Because the proposed project site is located outside the FEMA 100-year floodplain, the risk or release of pollutants due to project inundation is low, and **no impact** would occur.

[31] City of Citrus Heights, City of Elk Grove, City of Folsom, City of Galt, City of Rancho Cordova, City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, 2018. *Stormwater Quality Design Manual*. July 2018.

e. The CVRWQCB regulates surface water quality in the Central Valley via the Basin Plan, which was last amended in May 2018. As discussed above, with adherence to NPDES requirements during construction and operation, implementation of the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the Basin Plan.

The project site is located within the North American Subbasin. The Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) manages Sacramento County's portion of the basin via the North Basin Groundwater Management Plan (GMP), which was adopted by the SGA Board of Directors in 2014. As discussed above, the proposed project would improve onsite groundwater infiltration with the inclusion numerous open space areas and a stormwater retention area. For these reasons, the proposed project would not conflict with the GMP. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to hydrology and water quality impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Citrus Heights, City of Elk Grove, City of Folsom, City of Galt, City of Rancho Cordova, City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, 2018. *Stormwater Quality Design Manual*. July 2018.

City of Sacramento, 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft. August 2014. Page 7-19. Figure 7.2.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 2012. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Sacramento County California. Map Number 06067C0171H. Available: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=1401%20arden%20way%2C%20sacramento%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor. Accessed June 29, 2018.

XI. Land Use and Land Use Planning

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XI. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING — Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in the western portion of the Arden Arcade area of the City of Sacramento. The project site is currently vacant with remaining foundational elements and paving from the previously demolished hotel and associated structures. Adjacent uses to the project site include multi-family residential uses to the north and east, the Arden Fair Mall to the east, Business 80 to the west, Arden Way and hotel uses to the south.

The project site is located within the larger Arden Arcade Community Plan (AACP) area. The project site is designated as Urban Center High in the City's 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram. The Urban Center High land use designation is intended to provide thriving areas with concentrations of uses similar to downtown. Each center includes employment-intensive uses, high-density housing, and a wide variety of retail uses including large format retail, local shops, restaurants, and services. Building heights within the Urban Center High designation can range from two to twenty-four stories with lot coverage generally below 90 percent. Allowable uses within this land use designation generally include a balanced mix of high-density/intensity single-use commercial or residential development, or horizontal and vertical mixed-use development that includes retail, service, office, and residential uses. In addition, this designation allows for gathering places such as plazas, courtyards, or parks, and compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses.

Parcels within the project site are zoned for the C-2 General Commercial zone. The purpose of the C-2 zone is to provide for the sale of goods, the performance of services, office uses, dwellings, small wholesale stores or distributors, and limited processing and packaging. Permitted land uses in the C-2 zone include a variety of residential, commercial, and institutional primary uses. As it pertains to the proposed residential project, allowable residential uses include dormitory and duplex, multi-dwelling-unit, and single-dwelling-unit uses. Multi-unit dwelling uses are subject to special use regulations, as defined in City Code 17.228.117, which provide guidance for the required management of multi-unit dwellings. C-2 zones generally have a maximum allowable height of 65 feet, unless within 80 feet of residential zones, for which transitional height requirements limit maximum allowable height further. The project site is not within 85 feet of a residential zone.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts from land use and land use planning are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, impacts from land use and land use planning 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 Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- physically divide an established community;
- conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan;

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

As described in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, impacts related to land uses and land use planning were discussed in relation to plan or policy consistency issues that could occur with implementation of the proposed General Plan. The discussion includes an analysis of potential conflicts with local or regional plans as part of the environmental setting, specifically on the proposed 2035 General Plan and potential impacts relating to the standards of significance mentioned above.

As stated in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, the 2035 General Plan contains citywide policies as well as policies specific to the 10 Community Plans. The Master EIR analysis concluded that the proposed policies contained within the Community Plans are consistent and compatible with the proposed 2035 General Plan policies. Therefore, it was noted that the proposed 2035 General Plan has been designed as a cohesive plan focused around existing neighborhoods and developed areas, and would not physically divide an existing established community. In addition, the 2035 General Plan Master EIR noted that the General Plan had been designed to remain consistent with the City of Sacramento's Zoning Map, as well as the Land Use and Urban Diagram. Further, the analysis in the Master EIR stated that the General Plan reflected the principles identified in SACOG's MTP/SCS and would not conflict with the MTP/SCS. With relation to land use conflicts, the analysis in the Master EIR concluded that the proposed land use designations under the 2035 General Plan would not produce excessive noise, light, odors, or traffic that could result in a land use incompatibility with adjacent lands.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. The project would develop residential uses on an infill site designated for residential uses in the City's 2035 General Plan. The proposed project would not introduce features that would create a barrier, divide, or separate adjacent uses. Redevelopment of the site with residential uses would be generally consistent with the land uses in the area. The proposed project, therefore, would not divide an established community. There would be no new specific impacts under the proposed project; therefore, the impacts were all **analyzed under the prior EIR** and the policies and mitigation previously identified would still apply.

b. The proposed project would develop the project site in a manner that is consistent with the Urban Center High land use designation in the City's 2035 General Plan. The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include 731 multifamily residential apartment units.

The proposed project would remain within the C-2 General Commercial Zone and be consistent with the General Plan Urban Center High land use designation for the project site. The purpose of the C-2 General Commercial Zone is to provide thriving areas with concentrations of uses similar to downtown. It permits employment-intensive uses, high-density housing, and a wide variety of retail uses including large-format retail, local shops, restaurants, and services. Uses within the Urban Centers designation include major transportation hubs accessible by public transit, major highways, and local arterials, and pedestrian travel. Building heights within the Urban Center High designation can range from two to twenty-four stories, with a maximum height for C-2 zoning of 65 feet. Development standards for the Urban Center High land use designation include minimum and maximum densities of 24.0 and 250 units-per-net-acre, respectively and minimum and maximum allowable floor area ratios (FARs) of 0.5 and 8.0. The proposed project would be consistent with the C-2 zoning. Consequently, the proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. There would be no new specific impacts under the proposed project; therefore, the impacts were all **analyzed under the prior EIR** and the policies and mitigation previously identified would still apply.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to land use and land use planning impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft. August 2014. Page 6-95. Figure 6.11.

XII. Mineral Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) directs the State Geologist to classify (identify and map) the non-fuel mineral resources of the State to show where economically significant mineral deposits occur and where they are likely to occur based upon the best available scientific data. Areas known as Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) are classified on the basis of geologic factors, without regard to existing land use and land ownership. The areas are categorized into four general classifications (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4). Of the four, the MRZ-2 classification is recognized in land use planning because the likelihood for occurrence of significant mineral deposits is high, and the classification may be a factor in the discovery and development of mineral deposits that would tend to be economically beneficial to society. Areas where mineral resources have been exhausted are classified and MRZ-5.

The project site is in an area designated MRZ-1, which is classified by the State Geologist as an area where available geologic information indicates there is little or no likelihood for presence of significant mineral resources.[32]

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to the availability of mineral resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, impacts to the availability of mineral resources 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 Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

[32] City of Sacramento 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft. August 2014. Page 6-95. Figure 6.11.

- result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or
- result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Chapter 4.5 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, and existing mineral resources in the General Plan Policy Area. Implementation of identified policies in the 2035 General Plan was determined to reduce all effects on these issues to a less than significant level. General Plan Policies ER 5.1.1 and ER 5.1.3 protect mineral extraction activities within the City from surrounding uses. For areas where future development could occur, proposed General Plan Policy ER 5.1.2 requires that future projects near mining activities are compatible with such activities and requires buffer and setbacks from areas classified as MRZ-2.[33] These policies protect access to mineral resources.

Discussion

a-b. The discussion of Impact 4.5-4 in the Master EIR (pages 4.5-6–4.5-7) identifies that the City is required to develop policies that address mineral resource recovery areas that have been designated by the state as MRZ-2 (significant existing or likely mineral deposits). The 2035 General Plan includes policies intended to protect existing and future mineral production activities within the city. General Plan Policies ER 5.1.1 and ER 5.1.3 protect mineral extraction activities within the city from surrounding uses. For areas where future development could occur, proposed General Plan Policy ER 5.1.2 requires that future projects near mining activities are compatible with such activities and requires buffer and setbacks from areas classified as MRZ-2.

The proposed project would not conflict with City policies intended to protect access to mineral resources. As described in the Environmental Setting, above, the project site is in an area designated MRZ-1, which is classified by the State Geologist as an area where there is little or no likelihood for presence of significant mineral resources.[34] Consequently, the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in the loss of availability of a mineral resources, and the proposed project would have **no impact** on mineral resources.

Findings

The proposed project would not result in any impacts related to mineral resources.

[33] City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Certified March 5, 2015. Page 4.5-7.

[34] City of Sacramento 2014. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft. August 2014. Page 6-95. Figure 6.11.

References

City of Sacramento 2014. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft*. August 2014.

City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Certified March 3, 2015.

XIII. Noise

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XIII. NOISE — Would the project result in:					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

The following discussion presents basic information related to noise and vibration, as well as the existing noise environment at the proposed project site.

Noise Terminology

Noise can be generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound, traveling in the form of waves from a source, exerts a sound pressure level (referred to as sound level) which is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing and 120 to 140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain.

Sound pressure fluctuations can be measured in units of hertz (Hz), which correspond to the frequency of a particular sound. Typically, sound does not consist of a single frequency, but rather a broad band of frequencies varying in levels of magnitude (sound power). The sound pressure level, therefore, constitutes the additive force exerted by a sound corresponding to the frequency/sound power level spectrum.

The typical human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies of the audible sound spectrum. As a consequence, when assessing potential noise impacts, sound is measured using an electronic filter that de-emphasizes the frequencies below 1,000 Hz and above 5,000 Hz in a manner corresponding to the human ear's decreased sensitivity to low and extremely high frequencies instead of the frequency mid-range. This method of frequency weighting is referred to as A-weighting and is expressed in units of A-weighted decibels (dBA). Frequency A-weighting follows an international standard methodology of frequency de-emphasis and is typically applied to community noise measurements.

When a new noise is introduced to an environment, human reaction can be predicted by comparing the new noise to the ambient noise level, which is the existing noise level comprised of all sources of noise in a given location. In general, the more a new noise exceeds the ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise will be judged by those hearing it. With regard to increases in A-weighted noise level, the following relationships occur:

- except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1-dB cannot be perceived;
- outside of the laboratory, a 3-dB change is considered a just-perceivable difference;
- a change in level of at least 5-dB is required before any noticeable change in human response would be expected; and
- a 10-dB change is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness, and can cause an adverse response.

The perceived increases in noise levels shown above are applicable to both mobile and stationary noise sources. These relationships occur in part because of the logarithmic nature of sound and the decibel system. The human ear perceives sound in a non-linear fashion; hence, the decibel scale was developed. Because the decibel scale is based on logarithms, two noise sources do not combine in a simple additive fashion, rather logarithmically. For example, if two identical noise sources produce noise levels of 50 dBA, the combined sound level would be 53 dBA, not 100 dBA.

Noise exposure is a measure of noise over a period of time. Noise level is a measure of noise at a given instant in time. Community noise varies continuously over a period of time with respect to the contributing sound sources of the community noise environment. Community noise is primarily the product of many distant noise sources, which constitute a relatively stable background noise exposure, with the individual contributors unidentifiable. The background noise level changes throughout a typical day, but does so gradually, corresponding with the addition and subtraction of distant noise sources such as traffic and atmospheric conditions. What makes community noise constantly variable throughout a day, besides the slowly changing background noise, is the addition of short duration single event noise sources (e.g., aircraft flyovers, motor vehicles, sirens), which are readily identifiable to the individual receptor. These successive additions of sound to the community noise environment vary the community noise level from instant to instant, requiring the measurement of noise exposure over a period of time to legitimately characterize a community noise environment and evaluate cumulative noise impacts.

This time-varying characteristic of environmental noise is described using statistical noise descriptors. The most frequently used noise descriptors are summarized below:

L_{eq}: the energy-equivalent sound level is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, typically one hour, in terms of a single numerical value. The L_{eq} is the constant sound level, which would contain the same acoustic energy as the varying sound level, during the same time period (i.e., the average noise exposure level for the given time period).

L_{max}: the instantaneous maximum noise level for a specified period of time.

Vibration

Vibration is an oscillatory motion through a solid medium in which the motion's amplitude can be described in terms of displacement, velocity, or acceleration. There are several different methods that are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings. The root mean square (RMS) amplitude is most frequently used to describe the effect of vibration on the human body. The RMS amplitude is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal. Decibel notation (Vdb) is commonly used to measure RMS. The decibel notation acts to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration (FTA, 2006). Typically, groundborne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Man-made vibration issues are therefore usually confined to short distances (i.e., 500 feet or less) from the source. Sensitive receptors for vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly and sick), and vibration sensitive equipment. Fragile buildings can be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of 0.5 PPV without experiencing structural damage. The FTA measure of the threshold of architectural damage for conventional sensitive structures is 0.2 in/sec PPV. The human annoyance response level is 80 RMS.

Existing Noise Setting

The proposed project is in an urban area surrounded by commercial and residential land uses. Existing noise sources in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project are primarily limited to the vehicular traffic along I-80 Business and on local streets such as Arden Way, Sacramento Inn Way, Cormorant Way and Royale Road. To quantify the existing ambient noise levels, ESA conducted a noise survey within and in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The noise survey began on August 14, 2018, and consisted of one 24-hour long-term measurement and three 15-minute short-term noise measurements. **Figure 13-1** shows the location of the long-term and short-term noise measurement sites. The results of the short-term noise measurements are presented in **Table 13-1**. The results of the long-term noise measurement is shown in **Table 13-2**. The long-term noise measurement was conducted using a Larson Davis LxT2 sound level meter and all short-term noise measurements were conducted using a Larson Davis 831 sound level meter. The noise meters were calibrated before and after each noise measurement.

TABLE 13-1
15-MINUTE SHORT-TERM AMBIENT NOISE MONITORING RESULTS

Measurement Site	Start Date & Time	L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)	Primary Noise Source(s)
ST-1 (within south-west portion of the project site)	8/14/18 11:24 a.m.	61	54	74	Vehicular traffic along I-80 Business
ST-2 (north-east portion of the project site)	8/14/18 11:46 a.m.	54	50	59	Vehicular traffic along I-80 Business
ST-3 (within a housing community, east of the proposed project boundary)	8/14/18 12:18 p.m.	50	44	71	Neighborhood sounds

SOURCE: ESA, 2018

Figure 13-1 Noise Measurement Locations

TABLE 13-2
24-HOUR LONG-TERM AMBIENT NOISE MONITORING RESULTS

Monitor	L_{dn} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)	Assumed Primary Noise Source(s)
LT-1 (within the project site near the northwest boundary)	67	47	83	Vehicular traffic along I-80 Business

NOTE: Measurements started August 14, 2018 and concluded August 15, 2018, over a 24-hour period.

SOURCE: ESA, 2018

General Plan Policies Considered Mitigation

The following General Plan policies would avoid or lessen environmental impacts as identified in the Master EIR and are considered mitigation measures for the following project-level and cumulative impacts.

- **Impact 4.8-4:** Implementation of the 2035 General Plan could 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.

- **General Plan Policy EC 3.1.5 – Interior Vibration Standards:** The City shall require construction projects anticipated to generate a significant amount of vibration to ensure acceptable interior vibration levels at nearby residential and commercial uses based on the current City or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria.

- **Impact 4.8-5:** Implementation of the 2035 General Plan could 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.

- **General Plan Policy EC 3.1.6 – Effects of Vibration:** The City shall consider potential effects of vibration when reviewing new residential and commercial projects that are proposed in the vicinity of rail lines or light rail lines.

- **Impact 4.8-6:** Implementation of the 2035 General Plan could permit historic buildings and archeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic and rail operations.

- **General Plan Policy EC 3.1.7 – Vibration:** The City shall require an assessment of the damage potential of vibration-induced construction activities, highways, and rail lines in close proximity to historic buildings and archeological sites and require all feasible mitigation measures be implemented to ensure no damage would occur.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project noise impacts are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For purposes of this Infill Checklist, 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 2035 General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

- 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 Ldn 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

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 (General Plan Policies EC 3.1.1 and 3.1.2) and interior (General Plan Policies EC 3.1.3 and 3.1.4) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the General Plan. See General Plan 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. Notwithstanding application of the General Plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels (Impact 4.8-1), interior noise levels (Impact 4.8-2), and vibration impacts (Impact 4.8-4) were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a) ***Construction***

Construction activity noise levels at the proposed project site would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number and duration of usage for various pieces of construction equipment. Proposed project construction activities would involve demolition, excavation, grading and earth movement, foundations (concrete pours), materials delivery, building erection and cladding, roofing, exterior treatments (power washing,

painting, application of siding materials), and landscaping. Construction is expected to begin in the March 2019 and would be completed in approximately 26 months. The proposed project would include demolition of the existing structures within the project area. **Table 13-3** shows typical noise levels produced by various types of construction equipment.

The City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan or municipal code does not have noise level standards that are applicable to short-term construction activities. Although there are no applicable local policies or standards available to judge the significance of short-term daytime construction noise levels, the FTA's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* has identified a daytime 1-hour L_{eq} level of 90 dBA as a noise level where adverse community reaction could occur at residential land uses.[35] This noise level is used here to assess whether construction-related noise levels would cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels at sensitive receptor locations.

TABLE 13-3
REFERENCE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE LEVELS – (50 FEET FROM SOURCE)

Type of Equipment	L_{max}, dBA	Hourly L_{eq}, dBA/Percent Used[1]
Backhoe	80	76/40
Chainsaw	85	78/20
Paver	85	82/50
Concrete Pump	77	74/50
Crane	85	77/16
Auger	85	78/20
Plate Compactor	80	73/20
Bobcat	80	76/40
Excavator	85	81/40
Aerial Lift	85	78/20

NOTES:
1 "Percent used" were obtained from the FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide.

SOURCE: FHWA, 2006.

The nearest off-site sensitive respecter to the proposed project site consist of multi-family residences located within approximately 15 feet east of the proposed project site's eastern boundary. Noise from construction activities generally attenuates at a rate of 6 dB for every doubling of distance. Assuming an attenuation rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance, the closest sensitive land use would be exposed to a maximum noise level of approximately 91 dBA L_{eq}. Proposed project construction could expose those off-site sensitive receptors east of the project site to noise levels that would exceed the FTA applied adverse reaction threshold. However, to address future noise from construction

35 Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May 2006.

activities the 2035 General Plan includes Policy EC 3.1.10, which requires project proponents to assess and minimize impacts on nearby sensitive uses, to the extent feasible. The project proponent and construction contractor would implement best management practices (BMPs) for the minimization of construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors, including the use of temporary noise barriers, ensuring that all construction equipment has mufflers, strategically locating heavy equipment staging areas away from sensitive receptors, placing stationary equipment away from residential areas, and minimizing idling time. Since Policy EC 3.1.10 would require consideration of construction noise from proposed project and since project construction noise would be restricted in intensity and hours of operation by the City's Noise Ordinance contained in Title 8 – Health and Safety, Chapter 8.68 of the Municipal Code, development of the proposed project would include appropriate consideration of noise issues.

In addition, according to Chapter 8.68 (Noise Control) of the City of Sacramento municipal code, construction activities that occur between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday is exempt from the City's code pertaining to allowable noise levels. For this exception to take effect, all internal combustion engines must be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers that are in good working order. Since project-related construction activities would be limited to the exempt hours identified in the City's code and all internal combustion engines will be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers, construction of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of local established standards, outside of the times of day and specific days during which such construction noise is exempt from those standards.

The Master EIR analyzed potential noise impacts from project construction, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that the development process would include appropriate consideration of construction noise issues. Compliance with 2035 General Plan policies and Municipal Code would reduce the severity of construction noise from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan to less-than-significant levels. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

Operation

Exposure to Existing Off-site Sensitive Receptors

Most of the long-term noise that would result due to the implementation of the proposed project would be traffic-generated. The proposed project would contribute to an increase in local traffic volumes, resulting in higher traffic noise levels along local roadways. According to Policy EC 3.1.2 of the City of Sacramento General Plan, development projects that increases existing traffic noise levels by more than the allowable incremental increase shown in **Table 13-4** would require mitigation. Therefore, for the purposes of

this analysis, the City of Sacramento incremental traffic noise increases shown in Table 13-4 is used to evaluate if the proposed project's contribution to existing traffic volumes along local roadways would result in a significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

TABLE 13-4
EXTERIOR INCREMENTAL NOISE IMPACT STANDARDS FOR NOISE SENSITIVE USES (DBA)

Residences and Buildings where People Normally Sleep[1]		Institutional Land Uses with Primarily Daytime and Evening Uses[2]	
Existing L_{dn}	Allowable Noise Increment	Existing Peak Hour L_{eq}	Allowable Noise Increment
45	8	45	12
50	5	50	9
55	3	55	6
60	2	60	5
65	1	65	3
70	1	70	3
75	0	75	1
80	0	80	0

NOTES:
1. This category includes homes, hospitals, and hotels where a nighttime sensitivity to noise is assumed to be of utmost importance.
2. This category includes schools, libraries, theaters, and churches where it is important to avoid interference with such activities as speech, meditation, and concentration on reading material.

SOURCE: City of Sacramento, 2015. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan.* Adopted March 3, 2015. p. 2-351.

Using algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model Technical Manual and the estimated proposed project traffic volumes provided in the Arden Gateway Draft Transportation Analysis,[36] traffic noise levels were estimated for roadway segments in the vicinity of the proposed project under Existing and Existing Plus Project conditions. The segments analyzed and the associated results of the modeling are shown in **Table 13-5**.

As shown in Table 13-5, none of the sensitive land uses along roadway segments analyzed would be exposed to an increase in traffic noise that would exceed the incremental traffic noise increase standards identified in the City of Sacramento General Plan Policy EC 3.1.2. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significance impact in respect to exposing existing sensitive receptors to a substantial increase in traffic noise.

36 DKS, 2018. Arden Gateway Draft Transportation Analysis. November 5, 2018.

TABLE 13-5
EXISTING AND EXISTING PLUS PROJECT LDN TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS FROM A DISTANCE OF 50 FEET FROM CENTER OF ROADWAY

Roadway Segment	Existing Traffic Noise Levels dBA L_{dn}	Existing Plus Project Traffic Noise Levels, dBA L_{dn}	Incremental Traffic Noise Increase, dB	Incremental Traffic Noise Increase Exceeds City's Standard (yes or no)?[b]
Arden Way, south of Challenge Way	74	74	0	No
Arden Way, Challenge Way to Heritage Lane	74	74	0	No
Arden Way, Heritage Lane to Sears Driveway	74	74	0	No
Arden Way, Sears Driveway to Business 80	75	75	0	No
Sacramento Inn Way, south of Cormorant Way	53	55	2	No
Sacramento Inn Way, north of Cormorant Way	52	55	3	No
Silica Avenue, east of Cormorant Way	51	54	3	No
Cormorant Way, Sacramento Inn Way to Royale Road	51	51	0	No
Cormorant Way, Royale Road to Silica Avenue	56	57	1	No
Cormorant Way, north of Silica Avenue	57	59	2	No
Royale Road, Cormorant Way to Yorkshire Road	56	57	1	No
Royale Road, east of Yorkshire Road	55	57	2	No
Yorkshire Road, Royale Road to Bowling Green Drive	55	55	0	No
Yorkshire Road, south of Bowling Green Drive	47	47	0	No
Bowling Green Drive, west of Yorkshire Road	49	49	0	No
Bowling Green Drive, Yorkshire Road to Ray Street	56	56	0	No
Bowling Green Drive, Ray Street to Ethan Way	54	54	0	No
El Camino Avenue, Business 80 to Albatross Way	71	71	0	No
El Camino Avenue, east of Albatross Way	71	71	0	No
Albatross Way, El Camino Avenue to Woolley Way	61	61	0	No
Albatross Way, south of Woolley Way	58	58	0	No
Woolley Way, west of Albatross Way	61	61	0	No

NOTES:

[a] Traffic noise levels were estimated using the methodology described in the FHWA Traffic Noise Model.

[b] Existing land uses exposed to traffic noise that result in a noise increase greater than what is allowed in the City of Sacramento General Plan Policy EC 3.1.2 is considered a significant impact.

SOURCE: ESA, 2018

The Master EIR analyzed potential traffic noise impacts, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that increases in traffic noise within the Policy Area has the potential to add to annoyance perceived by sensitive receptors adjacent to roadways. Consequently, the City determined that with the implementation of feasible mitigation and noise-reduction policies, the City-wide increase in noise levels

from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would continue to be significant and unavoidable. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR** and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR

Exposure to New On-site Sensitive Receptors

Impacts of the environment on a project (as opposed to impacts of a project on the environment) are beyond the scope of required for CEQA review. However, for informational purposes, a discussion of the potential for future residents of the proposed project to be exposed to potential hazards associated with the existing noise environment is provided below.

The proposed project would be constructed in an area of the City designated as Urban Center High. Pursuant to the Noise Element of the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan, the City requires new development projects to incorporate mitigation if the project would result in an L_{dn} that would exceed an exterior noise standard of 70 dBA for urban residential infill projects, an interior noise standard of 45 dBA, or increase ambient noise levels by more than the allowable increment shown in Table EC-2 of the 2035 General Plan.

The Chapter 4.8 (Noise and Vibration) of the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master EIR provides noise levels and contour measurements for Business 80 between the SR 160 Interchange and El Camino Avenue. Since the proposed project is included in the traffic noise impact analysis found in the City's 2035 General Plan EIR, existing and future 2035 traffic noise levels found in Table 4.8-4 of the City's 2035 General Plan EIR are used to evaluate the project's consistency with the City's noise policies.

The western boundary of the project site would be anticipated to be lined with residential units, which would be set back approximately 100 feet from the centerline of Business 80. According to Table 4.8-4 of the City's 2035 General Plan Master EIR (page 4.8-9), the existing noise level along Business 80 between the SR 160 Interchange and El Camino Avenue is 84.1 dBA at 50 feet from centerline and projected to be 84.7 dBA under 2035 General Plan conditions, an increase of 0.6 dB over existing conditions. Table 4.8-4 of the City's 2035 General Plan Master EIR indicates that this incremental increase would not exceed standards shown in Table EC-2 of the General Plan.

As presented in Table 13-2, monitored long-term noise levels at the proposed project site were measured to be 67 dBA L_{dn}. This existing noise level would be considered to be acceptable for an urban residential infill project because it is below the City's 70 dBA L_{dn} exterior noise standard for urban residential infill sites.

To calculate interior noise levels, modeling assumes an interior-to-exterior noise attenuation of 25 dB due to building insulation and closed windows. With an exterior

noise level of 67 dBA L_{dn}, the proposed residential units would be exposed to interior noise levels of 42 dBA L_{dn}, which is below the City's threshold of 45 dBA. Interior and exterior noise levels at the proposed project site would be below the City's thresholds. The proposed residential units would be exposed to noise levels that would be below the City's compatibility and incremental increase thresholds.

The Master EIR analyzed potential noise impacts, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that some new development may be located in areas with high noise generation where implementation of all feasible mitigation would not fully reduce exterior noise levels below the City's noise standards, and existing sensitive uses could be exposed to noise increases associated with growth under the 2035 General Plan, such as increased roadway, rail, and air traffic. Consequently, the City determined that with the implementation of feasible mitigation and noise-reduction policies, the City-wide increase in noise levels from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would continue to be significant and unavoidable. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR. Additionally, the existing noise levels as measured would be below the levels analyzed and projected in the Master EIR. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR** and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

b) Construction activities would include demolition, site preparation work, foundation work (including concrete pours) and new building framing and finishing. Construction activities may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools such as vibratory rollers, large bull dozers or jackhammers are used. Proposed project construction activities would not require the use of equipment known to generate substantial groundborne vibration levels such as impact pile driving and blasting. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors to the proposed project site consist of housing located within approximately 15 feet east of the project site's eastern boundary.

The potential use of a large bulldozer would be expected to generate the highest vibration levels during project construction. Vibratory rollers typically generate vibration levels of 0.089 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet.[37] Vibration levels would vary depending on soil conditions, construction methods and equipment used. Using vibration attenuation equations found in the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, the residences located east of the project site's eastern boundary would be exposed to a vibration level of 0.191 in/sec PPV during onsite construction.[38] Consequently, construction-related vibration levels at the nearest off-site modern structures would be below the City of Sacramento 0.5 in/sec PPV threshold.

[37] Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May 2006.
[38] Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May 2006.

The Master EIR analyzed potential noise and vibration impacts from project construction, resulting from buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that the development process would include appropriate consideration of noise issues. Compliance with 2035 General Plan policies and Municipal Code would reduce the severity of construction noise from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan to less-than-significant levels. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and the proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

c. Sacramento McClellan Airport is the closest airport to the project site and is located approximately 3.3 miles north-east of the proposed project site. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport, private airstrip, or within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Finding

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to noise and vibration that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

Caltrans, 2013. Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. September 2013.

City of Sacramento, 2015. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. Certified March 3, 2015.

City of Sacramento, 2015. *Sacramento 2035 General Plan*. Adopted March 3, 2015.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 2006. FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide. January 2006.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May 2006.

XIV. Population and Housing

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

As disclosed in the Master EIR, Buildout of the proposed 2035 General Plan would result in Sacramento's population growing to approximately 640,400 by 2035. This is an increase of approximately 165,000 residents when compared to the estimated population of 475,500 in 2012 (U.S. Census 2014). The Master EIR also mentions that the 2035 General Plan includes a number of goals and policies designed to support infill development along with well-planned development that accommodates the growing needs of the city while also preserving the many unique aspects of Sacramento. In addition, the Master EIR notes that the 2035 General Plan includes goals and policies that encourage and support development of a range of housing types including higher density urban, and mixed-use to support and accommodate housing throughout the Policy Area, to encourage a jobs/housing balance, and to promote usage of alternate modes of transportation.

As stated in the Master EIR, SACOG forecasts project the city will have roughly 261,000 housing units and 387,000 employees by 2035. It is estimated that in order to achieve the 2035 projections, new housing development would need to outpace historical growth rates, and the city would need to add approximately 68,000 housing units, or about 3,000 new units per year.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to public services are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For the purposes of this Infill Environmental Checklist, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in induced substantial population growth, displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, or displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating construction of replacement housing and infrastructure.

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The analysis provided in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR included a discussion regarding impacts to population and housing in relation to existing levels of and trends in population, employment, and housing in the Policy Area and Sacramento County. In addition, the Master EIR also identified the 2035 Sacramento General Plan Update growth assumptions and analysis for projected population, employment, and housing growth in relation to planned buildout of the Policy Area under the 2035 General Plan Update.

The analysis provided in the Master EIR stated that buildout of the Policy Area under the 2035 General Plan's Land Use Diagram would accommodate projected population growth within the Policy Area. Based on this analysis, the Master EIR determined that the General Plan designates adequate land for a mix of residential densities to accommodate the projected increase in housing units contemplated under the Plan.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–b. The 2035 General Plan includes assumptions for the amount of growth that will occur within the Policy Area over the next 20 years. The 2035 General Plan Master EIR identifies, estimates, and evaluates population and housing changes that would be caused by development of the 2035 General Plan that have the potential to cause physical environmental effects. The Land Use, Population, and Housing analysis in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR (Chapter 3, pages 3-1-3-10) provides a detailed discussion of how the City reached these assumptions and the methodology used to determine a realistic level of growth for the City.[39]

The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include 731 multifamily residential apartment units**.** For the purposes of this analysis, an estimate of 2.65 persons per dwelling unit is used, which is the number of persons per household for the City of Sacramento identified by the U.S. Census Bureau for 2012–2016.[40] The net additional population, then, would be approximately 1,932 residents. This could be considered a conservative estimate, since no vacancy is assumed and the estimates from the Census are for occupied housing units only ("conservative" in this context meaning this may overestimate slightly the additional residential population associated with the project).

[39] City of Sacramento, 2015. City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. Certified March 3, 2015, pp. 3-1–3-10.

[40] U.S. Census Bureau, 2017. QuickFacts, Sacramento City, California. Available: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sacramentocitycalifornia,US/PST045217. Accessed May 3, 2018.

This projected population is consistent with the cumulative population growth assumed in the General Plan and Master EIR. The project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation (Urban Center High). There are no existing houses or residential uses on the project site; therefore, people and housing units would not be displaced as a result of project construction and implementation. Impacts due to the development of proposed project related to population and housing would be less than significant and were identified and **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project would not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to population and housing impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento, 2015. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report*. March 3, 2015.

U.S. Census Bureau, 2017. QuickFacts, Sacramento City, California. Available: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sacramentocitycalifornia,US/PST045217. Accessed May 3, 2018.

XV. Public Services

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:					
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
v) Other public facilities	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in the western portion of the Arden Arcade Community Plan area in Sacramento and is served with fire protection and police protection by the City of Sacramento.

The Sacramento City Police Department (SPD) provides police protection services to the project area. The project area is serviced by the William J. Kinney Police Facility, operating at 3550 Marysville Boulevard, approximately 3.6 miles north of the project site. In addition to the SPD, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol (CHP), UC Davis Police Department, and the Regional Transit Police Department aid the SPD to provide protection for the City.

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. SFD provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. First-response service is provided by Station 19, located at 1700 Challenge Way, approximately 0.7 miles south of the project site. Service is also provided by Station 20, located at 2512 Rio Linda Boulevard, approximately 1.7 miles northwest of the project site; Station 14 located at 1341 North C Street, approximately 3.7 miles southwest of the project site; and Station 4, located at 3145 Granada Way, approximately 3.6 miles south of the project site.

Twin Rivers Unified School District (TRUSD) serves nearly 27, 000 students on 52 campuses.[41] Elementary, middle, and high school students are assigned to a designated neighborhood school based on where the student lives, as long as the school offers the services the student needs. Each neighborhood school has a defined geographic boundary and is intended to serve the students who live within that geographic boundary. D.W. Babcock Elementary School, Martin Luther King Jr. Technology Academy, and Grant High School are the assigned schools for the proposed project site.[42]

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to public services are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For the purposes of this Infill Environmental Checklist, 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on various public services. These include parks (Chapter 4.9) and 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 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) reduced impacts on schools to a less-than-significant level. Impacts on library facilities were also considered less than significant (Impact 4.10-5).

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) and a park acreage service level goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents (Policy ERC 2.2.4). New residential development is 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).

41 Twin Rivers Unified School District, 2018. Available: http://www.twinriversusd.org/About/index.html. Accessed June 28, 2018.

42 Twin Rivers Unified School District, 2018. My School Locator. Available: http://locator.decisioninsite.com/?StudyID=206231#. Accessed June 28, 2018.

Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2).

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a.i The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include up to 731 multifamily residential apartment units with approximately 1,932 residents. The added population to the SFD services for the project area would be expected to increase as a result of the proposed project. It should be noted that the added population resulting from the proposed project construction would be temporary. Nevertheless, three fire stations are located in close proximity to the proposed project site. The proposed project would be served by SFD Station 19 located approximately 0.7 miles south of the project site, with backup service provided by Stations 20, 14, and 4.

The Master EIR analyzed the need to construct new or expanded fire stations to serve development pursuant to buildout of the 2035 General Plan. According to the Master EIR (page 4.10-5), the SFD requires a ratio of one fire station for every 1.5-mile service radius, per every 16,000 city residents, and where a company experiences call volumes exceeding 3,500 in a year. For purposes of the Master EIR analysis, a 1-station-per-16,000-city-residents threshold is used to determine citywide need for fire stations and whether the additional growth beyond that anticipated to occur under the 2035 General Plan would require the construction of additional fire stations resulting in additional environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Master EIR. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation and population growth assumptions in the 2035 General Plan. The General Plan Master EIR (page 4.10-7) concluded that at full buildout of the 2035 General Plan, including the proposed project site, the City would be required to provide approximately 10 new fire stations and additional fire personnel to accommodate the increase in population. As the proposed project is consistent with the growth assumptions for the project site in the 2035 General Plan, which were analyzed for impacts to fire protection in the Master EIR, the projected 10 new fire stations and additional fire personnel identified in the Master EIR as necessary to serve buildout pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed project would include fire protection features as required in the City Code, including fire alarm systems, fire extinguisher systems, and exit illumination. Therefore, impacts to fire service from the proposed project have already been **analyzed in a prior EIR**, and the project would comply with the requirements of the City Code, and General Plan policies regarding adequate fire protection services. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

a.ii Similar to the SFD, the added population from the proposed project would create an increased demand in police services to the project area. The project area, including the proposed project site, is currently served by the William J. Kinney Police Facility, operating at 3550 Marysville Boulevard, approximately 3.6 miles north of the project site. Although the proposed project would increase the service population for the SPD in the project area, the Master EIR states that the SPD uses a staffing ratio of two sworn officers for every 1,000 residents. Due to the infill nature of the proposed project, and recent demolition of previous uses on the project site, SPD staffing levels have up until recently been required to serve the prior hotel uses on the project site. Regardless, with the addition of 1,932 residents estimated for the proposed project, the staffing ratio would result in the need for roughly four sworn officers to maintain current service levels. In addition, the Department uses a variety of data that includes GIS based data, call and crime frequency information, and available personnel to rebalance the deployment of resources on an annual basis to meet the changing demands of the City. However, the project applicant would be required to pay fees for the provision of public services. Additionally, the location of the project would be consistent with established service areas in the Sacramento 2035 General Plan and SPD Annual Report.[43]

The Master EIR analyzed the need to construct new or expanded police facilities to serve development pursuant to buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that the 2035 General Plan included measures to accommodate for growth and increased service demands. The 2035 General Plan also identified several new police stations and associated facilities, identified in Table 2-2 of the Master EIR. For additional facility needs, the Master EIR determined that such facilities would be developed on property identified in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master EIR for urban development within the Policy Area. Through implementation of general plan policies, impacts to police facilities, from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would be less than significant. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. The City continues to implement General Plan policies to maintain police staffing levels and provide police facilities commensurate with ongoing population growth as projected in the 2035 General Plan, for which the addition of residents from the proposed project was assumed. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

a.iii The proposed project consists of up to 731 multi-family residential units, resulting in a permanent increase in population to the area of approximately 1,932 residents. The project site is within the Twin Rivers Unified School District (TRUSD). The Master EIR analyzed citywide impacts to schools from the buildout of the 2035 General Plan estimating student generation rates from multi-family residential units of approximately

43 Sacramento Police Department, 2016. Sacramento Police Department 2016 Annual Report. Available: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Police/About-SPD/Annual-Report. Accessed June 28, 2018.

0.19 for grades K-6, 0.03 for grades 7-8, and 0.04 for grades 9-12. **Table 14-1**, below, shows the estimated student generation from the proposed project, based on the student generation rates used to evaluate school impacts in the Master EIR. As shown in Table 14-1, the proposed project would be anticipated to generate approximately 139 students for grades K-6, 22 for grades 7-8, and 30 for grades 9-12. Because the project would be built in two phases and spread out over an extended period of time, with project completion estimated to be closer to 2023, impacts to TRUSD schools from the proposed project would gradually increase between Phase I completion and full occupancy of Phase II.

TABLE 14-1
STUDENT GENERATION ESTIMATES

Grade	2035 GP Master EIR – Multi-Family Student Generation Factors	Number of Additional Students*
K-6	0.19	139
7-8	0.03	22
9-12	0.04	30

NOTE:
* Number of dwelling units for the proposed project (731) multiplied by the student generation factors.

SOURCE: City of Sacramento, 2035 General Plan Master EIR, 2015; Twin Rivers Unified School District, Enrollment Data. http://www.ed-data.org/district/Sacramento/Twin-Rivers-Unified. Accessed June 28, 2018.

The Master EIR evaluated potential impacts to schools due to generation of additional students from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The 2035 General Plan provides policies for the reduction of impacts to schools from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. Implementation of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Policies ERC 1.1.1 through ERC 1.1.3 would ensure that adequate school facilities are provided to serve the anticipated student growth in the city. Those policies combined with required payment of statutory fees by developers would be sufficient to minimize potential impacts to school facilities to less-than-significant levels, from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As previously established, the proposed project would be developed consistent with General Plan policies and assumed development, which was fully analyzed in the Master EIR. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project have been **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

a.iv. The proposed project would be a residential development that would include up to 731 multi-family units with approximately 1,932 residents. This increase in population from the proposed project would result in increased use of existing park facilities and an increase in demand for additional park facilities.

The 2035 General Plan policies include measures to accommodate growth and increased service demands for park facilities. Policy ERC 2.2.5 requires new residential development to dedicate land or pay in-lieu fees for parks or recreation facilities. The proposed project would be required to ensure that adequate parkland is provided or applicable fees paid to the City to purchase additional park facilities.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts to existing parks and the potential to increase need for construction of new parks or park expansions, to adequately serve development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. The Master EIR identified that potential for significant impacts would increase if residential growth resulted in unexpected demand and the need for construction and operation of additional facilities. The 2035 General Plan designated numerous areas of the city for development of residential land uses of various densities. The growth projections based on the density of those land use designations, and anticipated economic activity during the planning horizon, included the development of park facilities. 2035 General Plan Policies ERC 2.1.1, ERC 2.2.1 through ERC 2.2.8, ERC 2.2.11, ERC 2.2.17, ERC 2.2.18, ERC 2.4.1, ERC 2.4.2, ERC 2.5.1, and ERC 2.5.4 support the City's ongoing program of planning, funding, developing and operating park facilities to serve the City' residents. The Master EIR determined that implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and the existing park planning process would be sufficient to minimize impacts, from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan, to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

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

a.v. The proposed project consists of up to 731 multifamily residential units, resulting in a permanent increase in population to the area. The 2035 General Plan policies include measures to accommodate growth and increased service demands on various public facilities, as described above.

The Master EIR analyzed the need to construct new or expanded public facilities to serve development pursuant to buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and redevelopment of the project site was included in development assumptions. The City determined in the Master EIR that the 2035 General Plan included measures to accommodate for growth and increased service demands. The 2035 General Plan also identified public/quasi-public land uses, identified in the General Plan Land Use Diagram and in the Master EIR. For additional facility needs, the Master EIR determined that such facilities would be developed on property identified in the 2035 General Plan and evaluated in the Master

EIR for urban development within the Policy Area. Through implementation of general plan policies, impacts to public facilities, from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan would be less than significant. As previously demonstrated, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to public service impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

Sacramento City Unified School District, 2018. Available: http://www.scusd.edu/attendance-areas. Accessed May 3, 2018.

Sacramento City Unified School District, 2018. Available: http://www.scusd.edu/our-district. Accessed May 3, 2018.

Sacramento Police Department, 2016. Sacramento Police Department 2016 Annual Report. Available: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Police/About-SPD/Annual-Report. Accessed May 4, 2018.

XVI. Recreation

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XVI. RECREATION:					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation (Parks) Department maintains parks and recreational facilities within the City of Sacramento. The Parks Department classifies parks according to three distinct types: 1) neighborhood parks; 2) community parks; and, 3) regional parks. Neighborhood parks are typically less than ten acres in size and are intended to be used primarily by residents within a half-mile radius. Neighborhood parks contribute to a sense of community by providing gathering places for recreation, entertainment, sports, or quiet relaxation. Community Parks are generally 10 to 60 acres and serve an area within approximately two to three miles, encompassing several neighborhoods and meeting the requirements of a large portion of the City. Regional parks are larger in size and serve the entire City, as well as population from around the region. Regional parks are developed with a wide range of improvements not usually found in local neighborhood and community parks. The City of Sacramento currently has 226 parks and parkways totaling nearly 3,200 acres of land.[44]

The closest park to the proposed project site is Babcock Park located approximately 0.6 miles north of the project site. Howe Community Park is located approximately 1.6 miles east of the project site. In general, neighborhood parks are located near the residential neighborhoods that they serve. The proposed project is also adjacent to the Arden Fair Mall, and within 1.1 miles of the Cal Expo grounds.

The 2035 General Plan establishes a goal of developing and maintaining 5 acres of neighborhood and community parks and other recreational facilities/sites per 1,000 residents. The 2035 General Plan also requires new residential development to meet its fair share of park dedication, payment of a fee in lieu of dedication, or a combination of the two. For new development in urban areas where land dedication or acquisition is constrained by a lack of available suitable properties, General Plan Policy ERC 2.2.5 requires new development to either construct improvements or pay fees for existing park and recreation enhancements to address increased use. Additionally, General Plan Policy ERC 2.2.5 requires the City to identify and pursue the best possible options

44 City of Sacramento Department of Parks and Recreation. 2015. Parks. Available: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/ParksandRec/Parks. Accessed October 9, 2018.

for park development, such as joint use, regional park partnerships, private open space, acquisition of parkland, and use of grant funding.

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

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to recreational resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards related to 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

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) and a park acreage service level goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents (Policy ERC 2.2.4). New residential development is 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). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2).

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a–b The proposed project would include outdoor amenities and open spaces for residents but would not include public park or recreation facilities on the project site. The City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation Department maintains parks and recreational facilities within the project area, as described in the Environmental Setting, above. The City requires developers to comply with the City's Park Development Impact Fee

requirements to finance the construction of park and recreational facilities that are impacted by development. The proposed project would be required to comply with all 2035 General Plan policies related to park impacts and pay any relevant park impact4 fees.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts to existing parks and the potential to increase need for construction of new parks or park expansions, to adequately serve development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As described in the Master EIR, the 2035 General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures would provide resources to protect and enhance existing facilities, while also supporting the programming and development of new parks, with the aid of developer impact fees. The Master EIR determined that implementation of 2035 General Plan policies and the existing park planning process would be sufficient to minimize impacts, from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan, to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Findings

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to recreation impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento Department of Parks and Recreation. 2015. Parks. Available: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/ParksandRec/Parks. Accessed October 9, 2018.

XVII. Transportation

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XVII. TRANSPORTATION — Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

The information on Environmental Setting and Impacts, presented below, is derived from the transportation analysis for the proposed Arden Gateway project prepared by DKS Associates for the City of Sacramento. The analysis report is summarized below and is presented in its entirety in **Appendix E**.

Environmental Setting

Roadway System - Regional Access

Regional automobile access to the project site is provided by Interstate 80 Business/Highway 160 (Business 80), also known as the Capitol City Freeway, and State Route 51 (SR-51). Business 80 provides access to regional, state, and national highways, including Interstate 80 (I-80), State Route 99 (SR-99), US 50 and Interstate 5 (I-5). Access to Business 80 is provided by interchanges at Arden Way, El Camino Avenue, and Exposition Boulevard near the project site.

State Route 160 (SR 160) is a northeast-southwest state highway that has an interchange with Business 80 at Arden Way. SR 160 provides access to North and Downtown Sacramento.

Roadway System - Local Access

Direct access to the project site is provided via Sacramento Inn Way and Royale Road. Other roadways providing site access include Arden Way, El Camino Avenue, Albatross Way, Challenge Way, Cormorant Way, Heritage Lane, Silica Avenue, and Woolley Way.

- **Albatross Way** is a local north-south roadway that extends north/south from Glenrose Avenue to Silica Avenue. It has one travel lane in each direction. The Street provides site access to El Camino Avenue. Albatross Way is stop-sign controlled at El Camino Avenue.

- **Arden Way** is an east west arterial roadway that runs from the Colfax Street to the west, where it becomes the Arden Garden Connector, eventually becoming Garden Highway, to its eastern terminus at the William B. Pond Recreation Area, in Carmichael, California. Arden Way is an 8-lane roadway, separated by a median in the project vicinity near the Arden Fair Mall, but is reduced to 4 lanes west of the Business 80 overpass.

- **Bowling Green Drive** is a local street that extends from Keith Way to a dead-end east of Ethan Way. The roadway has one travel lane in each direction. There are two sets of speed humps on Bowling Green Drive between Rockbridge Road and Ethan Way.

- **Challenge Way** is a north-south roadway that extends from Arden Way to Exposition Boulevard. At Arden Way, the north leg of the intersection provides access to Arden Fair Mall. Challenge Way has two through travel lanes in each direction.

- **Cormorant Way** is a local roadway that extends from Sacramento Inn Way to just north of Woolley Way. It has one travel lane in each direction. Cormorant Way provides access to Babcock School Park and D. W. Babcock Elementary School.

- **El Camino Avenue** is an east-west arterial roadway that runs from El Centro Road to the west, near I-80 and the Sacramento River, to Fair Oaks Boulevard to the east, in Carmichael, California. El Camino Avenue is a 4-lane roadway in the project vicinity, with a central turn lane as a median.

- **Ethan Way** is identified as a planned major collector road. Ethan Way currently runs north-south between Arden Way and El Camino Avenue. Ethan Way is a 2-lane road with a central turn lane as a median.

- **Heritage Lane** is a north-south roadway that extends from Arden Way to Exposition Boulevard. At Arden Way, the north leg of the intersection provides access to Arden Fair Mall. Challenge Way has two through travel lanes in each direction.

- **Ray Street** is a north-south local street that extends from Silica Avenue to Bowling Green Drive. It has one travel lane in each direction. There are speed humps north of Roy Avenue.

- **Royale Road** is a partially public and partially private roadway that forms the eastern boundary of the site. The roadway extends from the Arden Fair Mall parking lot to the south to Cormorant Way to the northeast. It is a local roadway with one travel lane in each direction. Royale Road is a public street between the site and Cormorant Way. Across the site and extending to the Arden Fair Mall parking lot, it is a private roadway.

- **Sacramento Inn Way** is a partially public and partially private roadway that forms the western boundary of the site. To the south, the roadway begins at the access driveway to Arden Fair Mall opposite Point West Way. To the northeast, the roadway parallels Business 80 and ends at a curve where the roadway becomes Silica Avenue. Sacramento Inn Way is a local roadway with one travel lane in each direction. I tis a public street between the site and Silica Avenue. Across the site and the Arden Fair Mall parking lot, it is a private roadway.

- **Silica Avenue** is an east-west local street that extends from Sacramento Inn Way to Cormorant Way. The roadway has one travel lane in each direction. Silica Avenue also exists east of Babcock School Park.

- **Waterford Road** is a local street that extends from Yorkshire Road to Ethan Way. The roadway has one travel lane in each direction. There are several speed humps located along the street.

- **Woolley Way** is an east-west local street that extends from Cormorant Way to Albatross Way. The roadway has one travel lane in each direction. Woolley Way provides access to D.W. Babcock Elementary School.

- **Yorkshire Road** is a local street that extends from Royale Road to a T-intersection with Bowling Green Drive. The roadway has one travel lane in each direction.

Bicycle/Pedestrian System

Near the project site, sidewalks are not consistently provided on both sides of most streets. Sidewalk connectivity in the project vicinity is intermittent. Although some roadways have continuous sidewalks lining both sides of the streets, many have discontinuous sidewalks or lack sidewalks on one or both sides. Along Sacramento Inn Way, sidewalks exist on the east side of the road. Royale Road and Cormorant Way both have sidewalks on both sides of the road in the project vicinity.

There are no existing or planned bikeways at the project site. The nearest bikeways are along Heritage Lane between Arden Way and Exposition Boulevard, and along El Camino Avenue between Del Paso Boulevard and Ethan Way (except for the missing link across the Business 80 interchange).

Transit System

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) operates 67 bus routes and 38.6 miles of light rail covering a 418 square-mile service area. Buses and light rail run 365 days a year using 76 light rail vehicles, 182 buses (with an additional 30 buses in reserve) powered by compressed natural gas (CNG) and 11 shuttle vans. Buses operate daily from 5 a.m. to 11 p.m. every 12 to 75 minutes, depending on the route. Light rail trains begin operation at 4 a.m. with service every 15 minutes during the day and every 30 minutes in the evening and on weekends. Blue Line and Gold Line trains operate until 12:30 a.m. and the Gold Line to Folsom operates until 7 p.m. Green Line trains operate every 30 minutes Monday through Friday.

Passenger amenities include 50 light rail stops or stations, 31 bus and light rail transfer centers and 18 park-and-ride lots. RT also serves over 3,300 bus stops throughout Sacramento County.

The project site is located within 0.5 mile of the Arden Fair Mall & Terminal (NB), which is the confluence of Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) routes 22, 23, 29, 67, 68, as shown in the attached Regional Transit Map. The Arden Fair Mall & Terminal (NB) includes bus service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.[45] See Figure 2 in Section III, Project Description, showing the location of the Arden Fair Mall & Terminal (NB) relative to the project site.

[45] Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT), 2018. Bus & Light Rail System Map. Effective April 1, 2018. Available at: http://www.sacrt.com/systemmap/. Accessed on July 5, 2018.

- **Route 22** (Arden) provides weekday peak period, midday, and evening services at 60-minute headways. To the west, this route extends along Arden Way to the Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station at Del Paso Boulevard. To the east, this route extends along Arden Way, Morse Avenue, and Cottage Way to Kaiser Hospital and Country Club Plaza.

- **Route 23** (El Camino) provides weekday peak period, midday, and Saturday service at 30-minute headways, and evening and Sunday service at 60-minute headways. To the west, this route extends along Arden Way to the Arden / Del Paso Light Rail Station at Del Paso Boulevard. To the east, this route extends along Arden Way, Ethan Way, El Camino Avenue, Fair Oaks Boulevard, San Juan Avenue, and Greenback Lane to the Sunrise Mall Transit Center in Citrus Heights.

- **Route 29** (Arden – California Avenue) provides peak direction weekday commuter service to Downtown Sacramento. To the west, this route operates along Arden Way and SR 160 to Downtown Sacramento. To the east, this route extends along Arden Way, Fair Oaks Boulevard, Palm Drive, California Avenue, Jan Drive, Winding Way, and Dewey Drive to the intersection of Dewey Drive and Madison Avenue. Route 29 provides two a.m. inbound and two p.m. trips.

- **Route 67** (Franklin) and Route 68 (44th Street) provide weekday peak period and midday service at 30-minute headways, and evening, Saturday, and Sunday service at 60-minute headways. These routes extend between the Arden Fair Transit Center and the Florin Mall Transit Center. Near the site, these routes travel along Challenge Way, Response Road, Heritage Lane, Exposition Boulevard, and Business 80. These routes provide access to the 29th Street Light Rail Station.

The nearest access to the SacRT Light Rail is the Swanston Station, which is serviced by the Sacramento Blue Line, providing service between north Sacramento at Watt Avenue and I-80 and Cosumnes River College in south Sacramento, including service to downtown Sacramento and Sacramento Valley Station. The Swanston Station is approximately 0.5 mile west of the project site, as the crow flies, and approximately 1.4 miles from the project site, via the most direct route provided by available pedestrian facilities. The Royal Oaks Station is also approximately 1.4 miles from the project site via available pedestrian routes and provides access to the light rail from Arden Way. The Royal Oaks Station is served by SacRT bus routes 22 and 23, which can be accessed from the Arden Fair Transit Center, to the east of the project site.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project transportation and circulation impacts are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For the purposes of this Infill Checklist, impacts resulting from changes in transportation or circulation 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 Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards:

Roadway Segments

A) The traffic generated by a project degrades peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A, B, C, or D (without the project) to E or F (with the project), or

B) The LOS (without the project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

Intersections

- The traffic generated by a project degrades peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or F (with project) or
- The LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more.

Freeway Facilities

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) considers the following to be significant impacts.

- Off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway;
- Project traffic increases that cause any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's level of service;
- Project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or
- The expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity.

Transit

- Adversely affect public transit operations or
- Fail to adequately provide for access to public transit.

Bicycle Facilities

- Adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths or
- Fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.

Pedestrian Circulation

- Adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths or
- Fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.

Summary of Analysis under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 4.12. Multiple modes of travel were addressed in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and

aviation components. The analysis included consideration of roadway and freeway capacity, identification of existing and future (including cumulative) levels of service, and effects of the 2035 General Plan on the public transportation system.

Numerous policies of the 2035 General Plan were noted to reduce potential adverse environmental impacts of implementation of the Plan. For roadway segments and intersections, these policies support: identification of level of service standards (Policy M 1.2.2); a transportation network that is well-connected (Policy M 1.3.1), elimination of "gaps" in roadways, bikeways, and pedestrian networks (Policy M 1.3.2), improved transit access (Policy M 1.3.3), improved connections to transit stations (Policy M1.3.5), identification of existing and future transportation corridors that should be linked across jurisdictional boundaries (Policy M 1.3.6), increased regional average vehicle occupancy (Policy M 1.4.1), and reduced single-occupant vehicle commute trips (Policy M 1.4.2).

Policy M 1.2.2 establishes a flexible Level of Service (LOS) standard that is specific to the context and unique characteristics of the neighborhood and community. This policy establishes that LOS F is allowed where projects include provisions to "to improve the overall system, promote non-vehicular transportation, and/or implement vehicle trip reduction measures …."

For bicycle, pedestrian, and transit elements of the transportation system, in addition to Policy M 1.2.2, described above, policies that would serve to reduce potential impacts include: preservation and management of rights-of-way consistent with the General Plan circulation diagram, the City Street Design Standards, the goal to provide Complete Streets as described in Goal M 4.2, and the modal priorities for each street segment and intersection (Policy M 1.1.1); increased multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1); evaluation of discretionary projects for potential impacts to traffic operations, traffic safety, transit service, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities (Policy 1.2.3); participation of commercial, retail, or residential projects in Transportation Management Associations (Policy M 1.4.3); provision of sufficient road travel space for all users including bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders (Policy M 4.2.1); ensuring that all street projects support pedestrian and bicycle travel (Policy M 4.2.2); an adequate street tree canopy (Policy M 4.2.3); pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities on bridges (Policy M 4.2.4); designation of multi-modal corridors in the Central City (Policy M 4.2.5); identification and filling of gaps in Complete Streets (Policy M 4.2.6); promotion of infill development (Policy LU 1.1.5); promotion of compact development patterns, mixed use, and higher-development intensities that use land efficiently, reduce pollution and automobile dependence and the expenditure of energy and other resources, and facilitate walking, bicycling, and transit use (Policy LU 2.6.1); creation of walkable, pedestrian-scaled blocks, publicly accessible mid-block and alley pedestrian routes where appropriate, and sidewalks appropriately scaled for the anticipated pedestrian use (Policy LU 2.7.6); neighborhoods that are pedestrian friendly (Policy LU 4.1.3); better connections by all travel modes between residential neighborhoods and key commercial, cultural, recreational, and other community-supportive destinations (Policy 4.1.6); and enhanced walking and biking in existing suburban neighborhoods (Policy LU 4.2.1).

For construction effects on the local roadway system, in addition to Policy M 1.2.2, described above, policies that would serve to reduce potential impacts include: ensuring mobility in the

event of emergencies (Policy M 4.1.1); and maximizing connections and minimizes barriers between neighborhoods corridors, and centers within the city (Policy LU 2.5.1).

While the 2035 General Plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, the Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable effects on roadway segments in neighboring jurisdictions (see Impact 4.12-3) and on certain segments of freeways in the region (see Impact 4.12-4).

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. ***Vehicular Mobility***

Operation

Vehicular trip generation estimates of the proposed project are based upon information published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, Tenth Edition. **Table 17-1** summarizes project trip generation estimates for the proposed project, including average daily trips and weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips. As shown in Table 17-1, ITE data predicts 5,531 daily, 318 a.m. peak hour, and 349 p.m. peak hour trips.

TABLE 17-1
VEHICULAR TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES

Land Use	Amount	Source	Vehicle Trips Generated (Trip-Ends)						
			Weekday	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Apartment	737 Units	ITE Land Use 220-Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)	5,531	73	245	318	220	129	349

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018; ITE Trip Generation, Tenth Edition, 2017.

For traffic analysis purposes, a set of intersections were selected to be studied based upon the anticipated volume of project traffic, the distributional patterns of project traffic, and known location of operational difficulty. In addition, neighborhood meetings for the proposed project identified specific intersections and roadway segments of concern to nearby residents and concerned citizens, those intersections along with intersections preliminarily selected for study include the following:

1) Business 80 Westbound Ramps and Arden Way;
2) Business 80 Eastbound Ramps and Arden Way;

3) Sears Driveway and Arden Way;
4) Heritage Lane and Arden Way;
5) Challenge Way and Arden Way;
6) Sears Driveway and Sacramento Inn Way;
7) Cormorant Way and Silica Avenue;
8) Business 80 Westbound Ramps and El Camino Avenue;
9) Business 80 Eastbound Ramps and El Camino Avenue;
10) Albatross Way and El Camino Avenue;
11) Albatross Way and Woolley Way;
12) Sacramento Inn Way and Cormorant Way;
13) Royale Road and Cormorant Way;
14) Royale Road and Yorkshire Road;
15) Yorkshire Road and Bowling Green Drive;
16) Ray Street and Bowling Green Drive; and
17) Ethan Way and Bowling Green Drive.

Roadway segments included for study include the following:

A. Albatross Way south of El Camino Avenue;
B. Woolley Way west of Albatross Way;
C. Silica Avenue west of Cormorant Way;
D. Sacramento Inn Way south of Cormorant Way;
E. Cormorant Way south of Silica Way;
F. Cormorant Way west of Royale Road;
G. Royale Road between Cormorant Way and Yorkshire Road;
H. Royale Road south of Yorkshire Road;
I. Yorkshire Road north of Bowling Green Drive;
J. Bowling Green Drive west of Ray Street;
K. Bowling Green Drive west of Ethan Way; and
L. Waterford Road south of Bowling Green Drive.

Existing intersection geometry (number of approach lanes and traffic control) is illustrated in **Figures 17-1a and 17-1b**. Peak hour intersection traffic turning movement traffic volumes are illustrated in Figures 17-1a and 17-1b. Traffic counts were conducted during the a.m. weekday peak period (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and the p.m. weekday peak period (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) as follows:

- Intersections 1 through 10 – Wednesday, May 24, 2017; and
- Intersections 11 through 17 – Wednesday, September 12, 2018.

Figure 17-1a Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Geometry

Figure 17-1b Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Geometry (Continued)

Daily (24-hour) weekday traffic counts are summarized in **Table 17-2**. Data was collected as follows:

- Segments A through H, J, and K – Wednesday, September 12, 2017;
- Segment I – Wednesday, September 26, 2018; and
- Segment L – Thursday, October 4, 2018.

TABLE 17-2
EXISTING ROADWAY SEGMENT DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Roadway	Segment	Direction				
		Northbound	Southbound	Eastbound	Westbound	Total
A. Albatross Way	El Camino Avenue to Woolley Way	1,434	1,894			3,238
B. Woolley Way	Cormorant Way to Albatross Way			1,103	1,216	2,319
C. Silica Avenue	Sacramento Inn Way to Cormorant Way			200	244	444
D. Sacramento Inn Way	South of Cormorant Way	228	301			529
E. Cormorant Way	Sacramento Inn Way to Royale Road	462	515			977
F. Cormorant Way	Sacramento Inn Way to Royale Road			116	123	239
G. Royale Road	Cormorant Way to Yorkshire Road	438	464			902
H. Royale Road	South of Yorkshire Road	490	520			1,010
I. Yorkshire Road	Waterford Road to Bowling Green Drive	391	315			706
J. Bowling Green Drive	Waterford Road to Ray Street			534	649	1,183
K. Bowling Green Drive	Surrey Road to Ethan Way			501	364	865
L. Waterford Road	Bowling Green Drive to Keith Way	121	145			182

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018.

Table 17-3 shows the existing a.m. and p.m. peak hour operating conditions at the study area intersections.

TABLE 17-3
EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS

Intersection	Existing			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS
1. Arden Way and Business 80 WB Ramps	8.7	A	11.0	B
2. Arden Way and Business 80 EB Ramps	9.7	A	9.3	A
3. Arden Way and Point West Way	2.9	A	9.0	A
4. Arden Way and Heritage Lane	19.8	B	37.4	D
5. Arden Way and Challenge Way	8.1	A	21.1	C

TABLE 17-3
EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS

Intersection	Existing			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS
6. Sacramento Inn Way and Arden Fair Driveway	3.4	A	1.7	A
Northbound Left	7.4	A	7.8	A
Eastbound Right	8.6	A	9.9	A
7. Silica Avenue and Cormorant Way	2.2	A	1.7	A
Northbound Left	7.4	A	7.3	A
Southbound Left	7.4	A	7.3	A
Eastbound	9.7	A	9.1	A
8. El Camino Avenue and Business 80 WB Ramps	5.2	A	6.0	A
9. El Camino Avenue and Business 80 EB Ramps	14.6	B	34.7	C
10. El Camino Avenue and Albatross Way	46.5	E	140.1	F
Northbound	>300	F	>300	F
Southbound	180.9	F	>300	F
Eastbound Left	13.0	B	13.6	B
Westbound Left	14.2	B	17.7	C
11. Albatross Way and Wooley Way	4.4	A	3.6	A
Northbound Left	7.7	A	7.6	A
Eastbound	10.4	B	10.0	B
12. Sacramento Inn Way and Cormorant Way	1.8	A	1.5	A
Southbound Left	7.2	A	7.2	A
Westbound	8.6	A	8.7	A
13. Royale Road and Cormorant Way	6.8	A	5.8	A
Northbound	8.6	A	8.6	A
Westbound Left	7.3	A	7.3	A
14. Royale Road and Yorkshire Road	4.9	A	3.5	A
Southbound Left	7.3	A	7.3	A
Westbound	8.8	A	8.7	A
15. Yorkshire Road and Bowling Green Drive	7.5	A	7.6	A
Northbound Left	0.0	A	0.0	A
Southbound Left	7.3	A	7.3	A
Eastbound	9.4	A	9.3	A
Westbound	8.7	A	8.8	A
16. Bowling Green Drive and Ray Street	7.0	A	7.0	A
17. Ethan Way and Bowling Green Drive	1.4	A	1.0	A
Northbound Left	8.1	A	8.1	A
Southbound Left	7.7	A	8.4	A
Eastbound	14.0	B	17.6	C
Westbound	11.2	B	12.5	B

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018.

As shown in Table 17-3, all the intersections meet the LOS criteria except for the intersection of Albatross Way and El Camino Avenue. This intersection operates at Los F in the p.m. peak hour, due to the long stop-sign delays on the northbound and southbound intersection approaches. There is no stop control for east and westbound traffic along El Camino Avenue. Therefore, all vehicle movements across and onto El Camino Avenue from Albatross Way, from the north or south of El Camino Avenue, are required to wait for openings in cross traffic to safely execute those movements. As shown in Table 17-3 vehicles attempting to make such movements during peak traffic periods are subject to substantial wait times and vehicle queuing.

Table 17-4 summarizes the roadway segment operating conditions. All the segments meet the LOS criteria.

TABLE 17-4
EXISTING ROADWAY SEGMENT CONDITIONS

Roadway	Segment	Operational Class	Lanes	Existing			Existing Plus Project		
				Daily Volume	Volume to Capacity Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	Volume to Capacity Ratio	LOS
A. Albatross Way	El Camino Avenue to Woolley Way	Local Street	2	3,328	0.67	B	4,434	0.89	D
B. Woolley Way	Cormorant Way to Albatross Way	Local Street	2	2,319	0.46	A	3,425	0.69	B
C. Silica Avenue	Sacramento Inn Way to Cormorant Way	Local Street	2	444	0.099	A	831	0.17	A
D. Sacramento Inn Way	South of Cormorant Way	Local Street	2	529	0.11	A	971	0.19	A
E. Cormorant Way	Silica Avenue to Royale Road	Local Street	2	977	0.20	A	1,696	0.34	A
F. Cormorant Way	Sacramento Inn Way to Royale Road	Local Street	2	239	0.05	A	294	0.06	A
G. Royale Road	Cormorant Way to Yorkshire Road	Local Street	2	902	0.18	A	1,566	0.31	A
H. Royale Road	South of Yorkshire Road	Local Street	2	1,010	0.20	A	1,784	0.36	A
I. Yorkshire Road	Waterford Road to Bowling Green	Local Street	2	706	0.14	A	817	0.16	A
J. Bowling Green Drive	Waterford Road to Ray Street	Local Street	2	1,183	0.24	A	1,238	0.25	A
K. Bowling Green Drive	Surrey Road to Ethan Way	Local Street	2	865	0.17	A	920	0.18	A
L. Waterford Road	Bowling Green Drive to Keith Way	Local Street	2	266	0.05	A	321	0.06	A

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018.

Table 17-5 summarizes the existing exit ramp queuing. None of the existing peak hour queues extends onto the freeway mainline.

TABLE 17-5
EXISTING PLUS PROJECT PEAK HOUR FREEWAY RAMP TERMINI QUEUEING

Ramp	Movement	Available Queue Length (lane-feet)	Maximum Queue (lane-feet)			
			Existing		Existing Plus Project	
			A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
Business 80 Southbound Exit to Arden Way	Left	405	105	108	105	108
	Right	405	32	65	32	65
Business 80 Southbound Exit to El Camino Avenue	Left	805	84	117	86	129
	Right	805	49	76	49	73
Business 80 Northbound Exit to El Camino Avenue	Left Lane	945	38	68	38	68
	Right Lane	945	240	555	240	555

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018.

The traffic study conducted for the proposed project modeled anticipated the distributions of vehicle trips associated with the proposed project based on the regional SACSIM travel model, observations of travel patterns near the site, and knowledge of the proposed access locations associated with the site. Trip distribution varies by time of day and direction of travel. **Figure 17-2** illustrates the trip distribution for the proposed project.

Traffic generated by the proposed project was added to existing traffic volumes. In this manner, the traffic and impacts associated with the project was directly compared to known and measured conditions. Impacts were determined by comparing traffic operating conditions associated with the project scenarios to traffic operating conditions without the project. **Figure 17-3** shows AM and PM Peak hour traffic volumes associated with the existing plus project scenario. Figure 17-3 also illustrates the intersection geometry of the existing plus project scenario.

The proposed project would cause delays to increase at most intersections and roadway segments. **Table 17-6** shows Existing-Plus-Project-Operation conditions at study intersections.

As shown in Table 17-6, the majority of study intersections operate at acceptable levels (LOS A-D) under existing conditions. Addition of vehicle traffic from residents and employees of the proposed residential project would worsen delays at study intersections, however, those delays would not worsen traffic conditions from acceptable to unacceptable under Existing-Plus-Project conditions, with the exception of the El Camino Avenue and Albatross Way intersection (Study Intersection 10).

Figure 17-2a Project Traffic Distribution

Use Figure 7 Sheet 1 of 3 from Traffic Study

Figure 17-2b Project Traffic Distribution (Continued)

Use Figure 7 Sheet 2 of 3 from Traffic Study

Figure 17-2c Project Traffic Distribution (Continued)

Use Figure 7 Sheet 3 of 3 from Traffic Study

Figure 17-3a Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Geometry

Figure 17-3b Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Geometry

TABLE 17-6
EXISTING PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATION CONDITIONS

Intersection	Existing				Existing Plus Project			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS
1. Arden Way and Business 80 WB Ramps	8.7	A	11.0	B	9.0	A	11.2	B
2. Arden Way and Business 80 EB Ramps	9.7	A	9.3	A	10.0	A	9.9	A
3. Arden Way and Point West Way	2.9	A	9.0	A	4.0	A	10.6	B
4. Arden Way and Heritage Lane	19.8	B	37.4	D	21.4	C	42.0	D
5. Arden Way and Challenge Way	8.1	A	21.1	C	8.2	A	21.5	C
6. Sacramento Inn Way and Arden Fair Driveway	3.4	A	1.7	A	4.6	A	2.3	A
- *Northbound Left*	*7.4*	*A*	*7.8*	*A*	*7.5*	*A*	*7.9*	*A*
- *Eastbound Right*	*8.6*	*A*	*9.9*	*A*	*9.2*	*A*	*10.2*	*B*
7. Silica Avenue and Cormorant Way	2.2	A	1.7	A	2.0	A	1.6	A
- *Northbound Left*	*7.4*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.4*	*A*	*7.5*	*A*
- *Southbound Left*	*7.4*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.4*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*
- *Eastbound*	*9.7*	*A*	*9.1*	*A*	*10.0*	*B*	*9.7*	*A*
8. El Camino Avenue and Business 80 WB Ramps	5.2	A	6.0	A	5.2	A	6.3	A
9. El Camino Avenue and Business 80 EB Ramps	14.6	B	34.7	C	14.6	B	34.9	C
10. El Camino Avenue and Albatross Way	46.5	E	140.1	F	76.7	F	275.8	F
- *Northbound*	*>300*	*F*	*>300*	*F*	*>300*	*F*	*>300*	*F*
- *Southbound*	*180.9*	*F*	*>300*	*F*	*194.0*	*F*	*>300*	*F*
- *Eastbound Left*	*13.0*	*B*	*13.6*	*B*	*13.0*	*B*	*13.6*	*B*
- *Westbound Left*	*14.2*	*B*	*17.7*	*C*	*14.5*	*B*	*19.3*	*B*
11. Albatross Way and Wooley Way	4.4	A	3.6	A	4.6	A	3.9	A
- *Northbound Left*	*7.7*	*A*	*7.6*	*A*	*7.7*	*A*	*7.7*	*A*
- *Eastbound*	*10.4*	*B*	*10.0*	*B*	*10.7*	*B*	*10.6*	*B*
12. Sacramento Inn Way and Cormorant Way	1.8	A	1.5	A	1.4	A	1.0	A
- *Southbound Left*	*7.2*	*A*	*7.2*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*
- *Westbound*	*8.6*	*A*	*8.7*	*A*	*8.7*	*A*	*8.9*	*A*
13. Royale Road and Cormorant Way	6.8	A	5.8	A	7.0	A	6.8	A
- *Northbound*	*8.6*	*A*	*8.6*	*A*	*8.6*	*A*	*8.7*	*A*
- *Westbound Left*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.4*	*A*
14. Royale Road and Yorkshire Road	4.9	A	3.5	A	4.3	A	2.3	A
- *Southbound Left*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.4*	*A*
- *Westbound*	*8.8*	*A*	*8.7*	*A*	*8.9*	*A*	*9.0*	*A*

TABLE 17-6
EXISTING PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATION CONDITIONS

Intersection	Existing				Existing Plus Project			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	Delay (Seconds)	LOS
15. Yorkshire Road and Bowling Green Drive	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.6	A
- *Northbound Left*	*0.0*	*A*	*0.0*	*A*	*0.0*	*A*	*0.0*	*A*
- *Southbound Left*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*	*7.3*	*A*
- *Eastbound*	*9.4*	*A*	*9.3*	*A*	*9.4*	*A*	*9.3*	*A*
- *Westbound*	*8.7*	*A*	*8.8*	*A*	*8.7*	*A*	*8.9*	*A*
16. Bowling Green Drive and Ray Street	7.0	A	7.0	A	7.1	A	7.0	A
17. Ethan Way and Bowling Green Drive	1.4	A	1.0	A	1.4	A	1.1	A
- *Northbound Left*	*8.1*	*A*	*8.1*	*A*	*8.1*	*A*	*8.2*	*A*
- *Southbound Left*	*7.7*	*A*	*8.4*	*A*	*7.7*	*A*	*8.4*	*A*
- *Eastbound*	*14.0*	*B*	*17.6*	*C*	*14.0*	*B*	*17.6*	*C*
- *Westbound*	*11.2*	*B*	*12.5*	*B*	*11.2*	*B*	*12.5*	*B*

SOURCE: DKS Associates, 2018.

The El Camino Avenue and Albatross Way intersection, which currently operates at LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and LOS F during the p.m. peak hour, would operate at LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour periods. In particular, northbound and southbound movements across El Camino Avenue for continued travel on Albatross Way are subject to substantial delays, where turning movements and east- and westbound travel on El Camino Avenue are subject to far shorter delays, well within acceptable levels. El Camino Avenue is not stop controlled at its intersection with Albatross Way, which requires all turning movements and north- and southbound movements to wait for clearings in east- and westbound traffic on El Camino Avenue, to execute those movements. In addition, the intersections of Albatross Way to the north and to the south of El Camino Avenue are not aligned, requiring north- and southbound through-traffic to execute complicated movements, involving utilization of the central turning lane in El Camino Avenue, to traverse the busy roadway. Under Existing-Plus-Project conditions, the intersection would be anticipated to operate at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour, with 30.2 seconds of additional delay relative to existing conditions. The intersection would be anticipated to operate at LOS F during the p.m. peak hour, with 135 seconds of additional delay, which would also exceed the 5-second threshold. Both peak periods would exceed the 5-second threshold under which vehicle traffic from a proposed project can impact an intersection that is already functioning at or below LOS E.

The project applicant would be required, as a condition of approval, to contribute fair share fees for the construction of facilities necessary to signalize the El Camino Avenue/ Albatross Way intersection, as required by existing City policy (2035 General Plan Policy M 9.1.1). The traffic study analyzed the effect on Existing-Plus-Project conditions, that would occur from adding a signal to the El Camino Avenue/Albatross Way intersection, determining that signalization of the intersection would reduce delays for turning, north-, and southbound movements at that intersection to LOS B (14.8 seconds average delay) during a.m. peak hour and LOS C (25.4 seconds average daily) during the p.m. peak hour. 2035 General Plan Policy M 1.2.2 accepts LOS E and F along segments of roadway for which other obstacles or City interests would prevent expansion of roadway capacity. The policy includes the segment of El Camino Avenue between Business 80 and Howe Avenue, which includes the Albatross Way intersection. Under this policy, the signalized El Camino Avenue/Albatross Way intersection would continue to operate at acceptable levels under Existing-Plus-Project conditions.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts to existing intersections and roadway segments from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As described in the Master EIR, although traffic volumes are projected to increase the 2035 General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures would ensure that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not result in significant LOS impacts. In particular, the Master EIR referred to Policy M 1.2.2, which accepts operation at LOS E for specific roadway segments, including El Camino Avenue, between Business 80 and Howe Avenue, which include Study Intersection 10. As previously established, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would generate a variety of truck and employee trips. Since the magnitude of these trips during peak hours would be less than the magnitude of trips from proposed project operations, absolute impacts (in terms of delay and queuing) when compared to project operations would not be significant.

Per City code, the project applicant is required to develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to the satisfaction of the City's Department of Public Works. The plan would include items such as: the number and size of trucks per day, expected arrival/departure times, truck circulation patterns, location of truck staging areas, location/amount of employee parking, a driveway access plan (including provisions for safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, minimum distance from any open trench, special signage, and private vehicle accesses), and the proposed use of traffic control/ partial street closures on public streets. The overall goal of the Construction Traffic Management Plan would be to minimize traffic impacts to public streets and maintain a high level of safety for all roadway users.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts to the existing transportation network from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As described in the Master EIR, although it may be necessary to restrict travel on certain roadways to facilitate construction activities, the implementation of a TMP, as required in Sections 12.20.020 and 12.20.030 of the Sacramento Municipal Code, would minimize potential for construction traffic to interfere with emergency response. In addition, any impact to LOS would be temporary and the implementation of the TMP requirement would reduce those impacts to less than significant. As previously established, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, construction impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Non-Vehicular Mobility

Transit

The proposed project would not adversely affect existing or planned transit operations. The project site is located along established transit SacRT bus routes, which provide a transit connection to other modes of transit, including the SacRT Light Rail. Construction or operation of the proposed project would not be anticipated to take place on the site of or in the pathway of existing SacRT facilities or operations. The proposed project would not be anticipated to have a substantial impact on existing or planned transit facilities.

Bicycle

As described in the Environmental Setting, there are no bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the project site. The City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan (Bicycle Master Plan) identifies existing bicycle facilities throughout the City and identifies proposed improvements to the City's bicycle network. The Bicycle Master Plan identifies proposed on-street bicycle facilities in the residential neighborhood and along Ethan Way to the northeast of the project site.[46] The proposed project would not be constructed along existing or planned bicycle facilities and, as such, would not be anticipated to impact these existing or proposed facilities. However, the proposed project would establish an on-street bike route between the project site and the D.W. Babcock Elementary School and existing bike lanes on El Camino Avenue. For this reason, the proposed project would not conflict with the implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan.

Pedestrian

The proposed project would construct sidewalks along the project's frontage along Sacramento Inn Way, Royale Road, and Cormorant Way along project frontage. In addition, the proposed project would install a pedestrian (sidewalk) system between the project site and the D.W. Babcock Elementary School as a condition of approval. The project would not conflict with future plans for pedestrian facilities.

46 City of Sacramento, 2016. *City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan*. August 16, 2016. Page 42.

Summary

The Master EIR analyzed the potential for implementation of the 2035 General Plan to adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and other non-auto mobility in conjunction with planned future development in the region. The 2035 General Plan included policy framework focused on promoting, improving, and facilitating non-auto transportation, included the policies summarized above. The City determined in the Master EIR that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would not disrupt existing transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or aviation facilities, nor would it interfere with planned facilities. As previously established, the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and other non-auto mobility from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

b. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact as they would result in a decrease in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). As discussed above in Section II, Satisfaction of Appendix M Performance Standards, the project is located within 0.5 mile of the Arden Fair Transit Center, which is served by several SacRT routes with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours. For this reason, the proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and this impact is **less than significant**.

c. The proposed project would add project roadways and private drives that would connect to existing City roadways. The proposed internal project roadways are designed to connect to and integrate into the existing roadway system surrounding the project site. The proposed internal project roadways would be local roads, subject to all applicable city regulations and design requirements, intended to maintain roadway safety. The proposed project would result in **no impact** from the introduction of design features or incompatible uses that would increase hazards.

d. The proposed project is designed to provide open access to internal project roadways, while implementing necessary intersection controls to maintain the safety of the localized transportation network. Each of the proposed standalone apartment communities would be gated; however, project gates would be equipped with Knox locks allowing for emergency vehicle access throughout the project site. The proposed project would not include design features that would prevent emergency vehicles or personnel from accessing the project site or adjacent properties. For these reasons, there would be **no impact** related to emergency access.

Finding

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to transportation and traffic impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

City of Sacramento, 2016. *City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan*. August 16, 2016.

Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT), 2018. Bus & Light Rail System Map. Effective April 1, 2018. Available: http://www.sacrt.com/systemmap/. Accessed on July 5, 2018.

City of Sacramento 2015. *Master Environmental Impact Report for the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan* (SCH# 2012122006). March 3, 2015. pp. 4.12-4 and 4.12-21.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*No Impact*	*Analyzed in Prior EIR*	*Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies*
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 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), 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The 2035 General Plan Update Master EIR (Master EIR) analyzed impacts of potential projects to archaeological resources, which would include tribal cultural resources, in the Policy Area, which includes the project site. The following is an excerpt from the Cultural Resources section of the Master EIR that discussed the general sensitivity of Sacramento for archaeological resources.

> The City of Sacramento and the surrounding area have had a long cultural history and 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 BR [Background Report], are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses. The proposed land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and, therefore, impacts on sensitive prehistoric resources. However, high sensitivity areas can be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today, and recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the entire 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.

ESA completed a records search that included the project site at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at Sacramento State University in April 2018. There are no previously recorded tribal cultural resources within the project site or within a ½-mile. The nearest prehistoric resources are a series of sites located at the edge of a former slough on the American River, approximately 2.5 miles west of the project site. The nearest historic-era archaeological resources are in the downtown area and consist of artifact-filled privies associated with early American use and occupation of Sacramento.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to cultural resources are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. A significant impact for purposes of this Infill Checklist would occur if the proposed project would result in one or more adverse effects on tribal cultural resources that would remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR or uniformly applicable development standards.

Summary of Analysis Under the 2035 General Plan Master EIR, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth-Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2035 General Plan on cultural resources (see Master EIR Chapter 4.4 and Appendix C – Background Report, B. Cultural Resources Appendix). The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historical resources and archaeological resources, which would include tribal cultural resources.

The proposed 2035 General Plan identified policies that would work to identify and protect tribal cultural resources along with other federal and state regulations, which could result in the preservation of tribal cultural resources. Policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 in the 2035 General Plan would protect tribal cultural resources by requiring surveys, research, and testing prior to excavation in high-sensitivity areas where there is no known previous disturbance of soils at the levels of the proposed excavation, proper handling of discovered resources, and enforcement of applicable laws and regulations.

The Master EIR indicates that feasible mitigation measures beyond the impact-reducing provisions of the proposed 2035 General Plan policies are not available and that protection of all important tribal cultural resources from damage or destruction cannot be assured. Therefore, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a.i-ii) Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources were disclosed and evaluated in the Master EIR (pages 4.4-8 through 4.4-9). As discussed in the Master EIR, the growth projected to occur within the city would occur both through infill development and build out of currently undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas. Increased maximum density allowances in the urban area could result in development that could damage prehistoric- and historic-period archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources. The 2035 General Plan contains policies that would work to identify and protect tribal cultural resources along with other federal and state regulations, which could result in the preservation of tribal cultural resources. Policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 in the 2035 General Plan would protect tribal cultural resources by requiring proper handling of discovered resources, and enforcement of applicable laws and regulations. The project site is not located in an area identified as high or moderate sensitivity for the occurrence of tribal cultural resources, as defined in the 2035 General Plan Background Report (Master EIR, Appendix C, Figure 6.4-1). No tribal cultural resources have been recorded within the project site and, based on the records search and Master EIR, Appendix C. Background Report, there is a low potential to uncover tribal cultural resource in the vicinity of the project site. However, while unlikely, there is the potential to uncover previously undocumented tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. Implementation of policies HCR 2.1.2 and HCR 2.1.16 of the 2035 General Plan would ensure that any previously undocumented tribal cultural resources, unearthed during project activities, would be appropriately handled so as to minimize impacts to those resources. Thus, implementation of existing city policy would be sufficient to offset potential adverse impacts to previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources.

No new information about tribal cultural resources has been discovered pertaining to the project site. There would be no new impacts under the proposal project, and the potential effects of the proposed project on tribal cultural resources were **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:					
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Water Supply

Water service for the project site would be provided by the City of Sacramento. The City provides domestic water service from a combination of surface water and groundwater sources including the American River, Sacramento River, and groundwater wells. Water from the American River and Sacramento River is diverted by two water treatment plants: Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant (WTP), located at the southern end of Bercut Drive approximately 2 miles north of the project site, and the E.A. Fairbairn Water Treatment Plant (EAFWTP), located at the northeast corner of State University Drive South and College Town Drive approximately 5 miles east of the project site. Water diverted from the Sacramento and American Rivers is treated, stored in storage reservoirs, and pumped to customers via a conveyance network.

The City of Sacramento complies with the California Water Code, which requires urban water suppliers to prepare and adopt Urban Water Management Plan (UWMPs) every five years. The most recent UWMP was adopted in 2016, and includes an analysis of water demand sufficiency under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios. Water supply and demand projections include future planned development until 2040, projected by the City assuming a

growth rate inside the existing service area boundary consistent with the 2035 General Plan.[47] Based, in part, on these projections, the City possesses sufficient water supply entitlements and treatment capacity during normal, dry, and multiple dry years to meet the demands of its customers up to the year 2040.[48]

Wastewater and Stormwater

Wastewater for the project site is collected by the Sacramento Area Sewer District's (SASD) Separated Sewer System, conveyed to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (RegionalSan) system, and ultimately treated at the RegionalSan Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP), which is located in Elk Grove. Local stormwater drainage in and surrounding the project area is collected by City storm drain systems, and pumped or gravity flown into nearby drainages, creeks, and rivers.

The SRWTP is owned and managed by the RegionalSan, which provides regional wastewater conveyance and treatment services to commercial, residential, and industrial end users within the City of Sacramento, several other areas including Sacramento County and the cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Rancho Cordova, and West Sacramento, as well as the communities of Courtland and Walnut Grove. RegionalSan maintains 177 miles of interceptor pipelines. The existing SRWTP currently maintains a maximum average dry weather treatment capacity of 181 million gallons per day (mgd). As of 2014, actual average dry weather flow for the facility was approximately 106 mgd, substantially lower than the facility's capacity.[49] Treated effluent is discharged into the Sacramento River.

The project site's existing stormwater facilities include a network of drainage pipes that drain stormwater from west to east, toward the City drainage canal along the east side of the project site, which flows south.

Solid Waste Disposal

Solid waste in the city of Sacramento is collected by the City and permitted private haulers. The City offers both commercial and residential solid waste collection services. Construction and demolition waste is collected by the City and private companies, based on the type of construction waste. The Sacramento County Kiefer Landfill is the primary location for the disposal of waste in the City of Sacramento. The landfill accepts municipal waste and industrial waste and is permitted to accept up to 10,815 tons per day, averaging 6,300 tons per day.[50] It is the only landfill facility in Sacramento County permitted to accept household waste from the public. Current peak and average daily disposal is much lower than the current permitted

47 City of Sacramento, 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan*. Adopted June 21, 2016. Page 3-7.

48 City of Sacramento, 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan.* Adopted June 21, 2016. Pages 7-10 through 7-12.

49 MacKay & Somps Civil Engineers, 2015. *RegionalSan Capacity Analysis - Sutter Pointe Wastewater Conveyance Project*. p. 19.

50 California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), 2013. Solid Waste Facility Permit 34-AA-0001, updated June 2013.

amounts. As of 2012, 305 acres of the 660 acres contain waste.[51] The landfill facility sits on 1,084 acres. As a result, the Kiefer Landfill should be able to serve the area until the year 2065.[52]

Electrical Service

The project site would be provided electrical service by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). The project site is served by an extensive system of transmission lines, which supplied power to previous development on the project site.

Natural Gas

The project site is provided natural gas service by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), which provides service to the City of Sacramento through both high and low-pressure systems.

Telecommunications

The proposed project would acquire telephone and data service from the current existing carrier(s) that include the project site within their service area. Connection(s) would be completed in existing telephonic and data manholes.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to utilities and service systems are based on Appendix N of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the City in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgment. For the purposes of this Infill Environmental Checklist, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to water, wastewater, or other utilities 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, Including Cumulative Impacts, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Irreversible Significant Effects

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 2035 General Plan would reduce the impact generally to a less-than-significant level (see Impact 4.11-1) but the need for new water

51 City of Sacramento 2014. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft*. August 2014. Page 4-45.

52 City of Sacramento 2014. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft*. August 2014. Page 4-45.

supply facilities results in a significant and unavoidable effect (Impact 4.11-2). Increased generation of wastewater and stormwater could result in the need for additional conveyance facilities (Impact 4.11-3) but there are established plans and fee programs in place as well as proposed policies to increase conveyance capacity in response to demand. Impacts to conveyance facilities are less than significant. The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a less than significant effect (Impact 4.11-4) because RegionalSan has determined that the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant would have sufficient capacity throughout the General Plan planning period, and no capacity expansion at the plant would be expected. 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 (Impact 4.11-6). Demand for telecommunications facilities would be met through long-range planning of telecommunication facilities for new development areas, resulting in a less-than-significant impact (Impact 4.11-7).

Mitigation Measures from 2035 General Plan Master EIR that apply to the Project

None.

Discussion

a. The proposed residential units would connect to the existing 6-inch, 8-inch and 18-inch water supply mains underlying the project site. In addition, the proposed project would be served by existing sewer and storm water lines underlying the project site and existing electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication infrastructure adjacent to the project site. Other than connections between the project buildings and the existing infrastructure, where existing service laterals that served previous development on the project site would not be sufficient, no further improvements to these systems would be required. For this reason, the proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. For these reasons, there would be no impact from the relocation of or construction of new water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential impacts from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As described in the Master EIR, the existing facilities for utilities and service systems would be expanded to meet the demands of development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan through a process of long range planning. As described in the Master EIR (page 4.11-15), RegionalSan has a program in place to continually evaluate demand/ capacity needs, and the master planning effort provides the flexibility to respond to changes in demand that can be anticipated in advance of planned improvements so that capacity issues are addressed in a timely and cost-effective manner. Master planning efforts that would identify necessary improvement in capacity to accommodate city growth beyond the 2020 Master Plan timeframe would be initiated well in advance of

2035. The projected water demand from the proposed project was accounted for in the City's 2035 General Plan and Master EIR, as the project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The Master EIR (pages 4.11-6 through 4.11-7) concluded that the City's existing water right permits and United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) contract are sufficient to meet the total water demand projected for buildout of the proposed 2035 General Plan, including the proposed project site. In addition, according to the 2015 Sacramento Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which is based on the development assumptions in the 2035 General Plan, the City would have adequate water supply to serve the total anticipated demand associated with City buildout, even in multiple dry year scenarios, out to 2040. Construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

b. Water demand for the proposed project was determination using the City's Water Supply Assessment and Certification Form (see **Appendix F**), as required for multi-family residential developments with more than 500 units. The demands are broken into two categories of water use factors, residential and non-residential. The residential water demand factors are based on acre-feet of water demand per-year (AFY), per dwelling unit (DU; AFY/DU). For the proposed project, all of the anticipated dwelling units would be in the Urban Center High category, based on the General Plan land use designation for the project site, which has a residential water demand factor of 0.15 AFY/DU. Therefore, the 731 apartment units from the proposed project would be anticipated to have a water demand of approximately 109.4 AFY/DU.

The projected water demand from the proposed project was accounted for in the City's 2035 General Plan and Master EIR, as the project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The Master EIR (pages 4.11-6 through 4.11-7) concluded that the City's existing water right permits and United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) contract are sufficient to meet the total water demand projected for buildout of the proposed 2035 General Plan, including the proposed project site. In addition, according to the 2015 Sacramento Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which is based on the development assumptions in the 2035 General Plan, the City would have adequate water supply to serve the total anticipated demand associated with City buildout, even in multiple dry year scenarios, out to 2040. Because the City would have adequate capacity of water supply at buildout of the 2035 General Plan, and the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, impacts from the proposed project, as they relate to water supply, have been **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

c. The proposed project would be an entirely residential development that would include 731 residential apartment units**.** For the purposes of this analysis, an estimate of 2.65 persons per dwelling unit is used, as described in Issue XIV. Population and Housing, to estimate that the proposed project would generate approximately 1,932 residents.

Development of the proposed project was assumed under the 2035 General Plan and analyzed in the Master EIR.

As described in the Master EIR (page 4.11-15), RegionalSan has a program in place to continually evaluate demand/capacity needs, and the master planning effort provides the flexibility to respond to changes in demand that can be anticipated in advance of planned improvements so that capacity issues are addressed in a timely and cost-effective manner. Master planning efforts that would identify necessary improvement in capacity to accommodate city growth beyond the 2020 Master Plan timeframe would be initiated well in advance of 2035. To fund expansions to the conveyance systems, RegionalSan requires a regional connection fee be paid to the District for any users connecting to or expanding sewer collection systems (RegionalSan Ordinance No. SRCSD-0043).

Therefore, because there are established plans and fee programs in place as well as proposed policies to increase conveyance and treatment facility capacity in response to demand, and the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, impacts from the proposed project, as they relate to wastewater treatment, have been **analyzed in a prior EIR**.

d-e. The proposed project would develop 731 residential apartment units that would generate solid waste, requiring landfill capacity. To determine the amount of solid waste that could be generated by the proposed project, this analysis mirrors the analysis used in the Master EIR (Impact 4.11-5, page 4.11-20). The analysis uses information provided by the City of Sacramento. The residential rate was provided by the City of Sacramento, as part of the proposed Master EIR analysis. The analysis of the Master EIR estimated residential solid waste generation to be 1.1 tons per unit per year (tons/unit/year). Using the estimated number of dwelling units proposed by the project in conjunction with the given rate of 1.1 tons of solid waste/unit/year, it can be assumed that by 2035 residences in the proposed project would generate approximately 801.9 tons of solid waste per year.

The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to solid waste management. Construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with City demolition and construction requirements to divert a minimum of 50 percent of construction wastes to a certified recycling processor. Operation of the proposed project would result in the generation of municipal wastes, as described above. Waste generated by the proposed project would be collected and transported to local landfills by the City and/or private haulers, and either recycled in accordance with City programs and requirements, or landfilled at Kiefer Landfill or transported and landfilled at the Lockwood Landfill. As noted previously, these facilities together currently have approximately 458 million cubic yards in available capacity.[53] The proposed project-related wastes would represent less than one-thousandth of one percent (<0.001%) of total annual capacity for these two landfills. Sufficient landfill capacity would be available to serve the proposed project and would not require new or expanded solid

[53] One cubic yard is equivalent to approximately 0.1125 tons uncompacted, or approximately 0.375 tons compacted, as waste would arrive at the landfill from trucks or other transport equipment.

waste management or disposal facilities. Additionally, implementation of typical recycling rates, and SWA and City recycling requirements would result in a portion of the total waste stream being diverted to recycling. This would further minimize impacts to landfill capacity.

The Master EIR analyzed the potential solid waste impacts from development pursuant to the 2035 General Plan. As described in the Master EIR, the existing capacities of landfills that serve the City of Sacramento substantially exceed the necessary capacities to accept solid waste through buildout of the 2035 General Plan, with capacities anticipated to be sufficient through 2065. In addition, the 2035 General Plan includes goals, policies and implementation measures that would increase recycling and solid waste diversion. In conjunction with increasing diversion requirements, cumulative impacts on landfill capacity would be such that there would be no need to expand or create new landfill or solid waste management facilities. Construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions and policies of the 2035 General Plan, and would be in compliance with federal state, and local requirements regarding solid waste disposal and diversion. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project were **analyzed in a prior EIR**. The proposed project will not result in any new specific effects not addressed in the Master EIR.

Finding

The proposed project would not have any significant effects relating to utilities and service system impacts that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed.

References

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), 2013. Solid Waste Facility Permit 34-AA-0001, updated June 2013.

City of Sacramento 2014. *City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Public Review Draft*. August 2014. p. 4-45.

City of Sacramento, 2016. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan*. June 21, 2016. Page 3-7 through 7-12.

MacKay & Somps Civil Engineers, 2015. *RegionalSan Capacity Analysis - Sutter Pointe Wastewater Conveyance Project*. p. 19.

XX. Wildfire

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*No Impact*	*Analyzed in Prior EIR*	*Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies*
XX. WILDFIRE — If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a-d) The project site is within a fully urbanized area in the City of Sacramento that is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The proposed project would result in **no impact** related to wildfire.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a-c. Development of the project site as the proposed project was assumed in the 2035 General Plan and analyzed in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR. The proposed project is consistent with General Plan policy. The cumulative effects, growth-inducing effects, and irreversible significant effects that could occur as a result of development allowed under the 2035 General Plan were evaluated in the Master EIR. The project would not result in any significant effects that were not evaluated in the Master EIR.

Section V – Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The infill project could potentially result in one or more of the following environmental effects.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Section VI – Determination

On the basis of this Infill Environmental Checklist:

☒ I find that the proposed infill project WOULD NOT have any significant effects on the environment that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed, or that uniformly applicable development policies would not substantially mitigate. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21094.5, CEQA does not apply to such effects. A Notice of Determination (Section 15094) will be filed.

☐ I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. With respect to those effects that are subject to CEQA, I find that such effects WOULD NOT be significant and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that although those effects could be significant, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the infill project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed infill project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that those effects WOULD be significant, and an infill ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze those effects that are subject to CEQA.

Signature

February 26, 2019
Date