

ATTACHMENT C



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
PLANNING DIVISION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

1231 I STREET
ROOM 300
SACRAMENTO, CA
95814

TEL. 916-264-5894
FAX 916-264-5328

REVISED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, make, declare, and publish this Negative Declaration for the following described project: **Cambay West (P99-135):**

- A. **Negative Declaration**
- B. **Mitigation Monitoring Plan**
- C. **Development Agreement** between City and Cambay Group
- D. **General Plan Amendment** on 120 \pm vacant acres from 61.2 \pm acres of Mixed Use, 18.8 \pm acres of medium density residential, 30.5 \pm acres of low density residential, and 10.2 \pm acres of Open Space to 28 \pm acres of Mixed Use, 11.6 \pm acres of Medium Density Residential, 17.3 \pm acres of Open Space, 44.4 \pm acres of Low Density Residential and 19.1 \pm acres of High Density Residential.
- E. **North Natomas Community Plan Amendment** on 120 \pm vacant acres from 7.0 \pm acres of EC-65, 54.2 \pm acres of EC-40, 18.8 \pm acres of medium density residential, and 30.5 \pm acres of medium density residential, to 7.5 \pm acres of Employment Center 65; 20.5 \pm acres of Employment Center 40; 19.1 \pm acres of High Density; 11.6 \pm acres of Medium Density; 44.4 \pm acres of Low Density; and 17.3 \pm acres of Open Space/Park.
- F. **Rezone** of 120 \pm acres from A-OS, to 7.5 \pm acres of EC 65-PUD; 20.5 \pm acres of EC 40-PUD; 22.4 \pm acres of R-1A-PUD; 22.0 \pm acres of R-1-PUD, 11.6 \pm acres of R-2A-PUD; 19.1 \pm acres of R-3-PUD, and 16 \pm acres of A-OS-PUD and 1.3 \pm acres of Caltrans acquisition right of way.
- G. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the boundaries of the Neighborhood #9 Planned Unit Development (PUD) from 248.67 \pm acres to 269.4 \pm acres by adding a 20.8 \pm acre portion of the project area.
- H. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the Gateway West PUD for Cambay West Development.
- I. **Tentative Master Parcel Map** to subdivide 13 lots totaling 120 \pm vacant acres (Lots A-K and Villages 1 & 2)
- J. **Tentative Subdivision Map** for 101 single family lots for Village #1; 109 single family lots for Village #2; Medium Density Residential Lots E and G; High Density Residential Lots C and D; Employment

Center 40 Lot B; Employment Center 65 Lot A; Open Space-Freeway Corridor Lot H; Open Space-Park Lot F; and Interstate 5 right of way (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication) Lot I.

K. **Subdivision Modification** to allow a non-standard street section (47' width) adjacent to the proposed parksite.

The City of Sacramento, Department of Planning and Building, has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project, with mitigation measures, as identified in the attached Initial Study, will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento; and the Sacramento City Code, Title 63.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Department of Planning and Building, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, California 95814.

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

By: Scot Mende

Revision Date: 01/10/01

P99-135

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
PLANNING DIVISION

TIERED INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been required and prepared by the Department of Planning and Building, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15063.

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. File Number/Project Name:
P99-135: Cambay West Project/ Development of a 120.26 vacant gross acres for multiple uses – residential, employment center, park and open spaces.
2. Project Location/APNs:
Southwest quadrant of Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road in North Natomas (see Attachment 2)
225-0080-030 to 032; and 225-0070-028
3. Applicant's Name, Address, Phone Number:
Pacific-Teal Development, Inc. (Attention: Terry Teeple)
22672 Lambert Street, #616
Lake Forest, CA 92630
(949) 586-2066
4. Owner Name, Address:
The Cambay Group, Inc.
1350 Treat Blvd., Suite 560
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
(925) 933-1405
5. Project Planner's Name and Phone Number:
Scot Mende, Senior Planner, City of Sacramento
264-5894
6. Date Environmental Checklist Completed: December 23, 2000

II PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The subject property consists of 120.2± gross acres, located at the southwest corner of Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road in the North Natomas Community Plan area. The site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN): 225-0080-030 to 032; and 225-0070-028.

Statement of Applicant's Objectives

Pacific-Teal Development, Inc. has submitted an application to the City of Sacramento's Planning and Building Department for the necessary entitlements to develop a site located in the southwest quadrant of Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road in the North Natomas community (see Attachment). The total project area is 120.26 gross acres. The applicant is proposing a total of 210 low density single family residential units on 44.4 acres; medium density residential units on 11.6 acres; and high density multi-family units on 19.1 acres. The proposal also includes 7.0 acres of Employment Center 65; 54.2 acres of Employment Center 40; 17.3 acres of Open Space/Park. In addition, 1.3 acres for ultimate widening of Interstate 5 is reserved for Irrevocable Offer of Dedication as part of the proposal.

A Master Plan is currently being prepared for a proposed Cambay West parksite. The Master Plan will be reviewed by the Citizens Advisory Committee. At this time, the total budget for Phase 1 is tentatively set at \$486,184. Future phases are not yet funded. "Phase 1" is expected to include: 5.2 acre Neighborhood park site developed with irrigated turf, trees, and hardscape(concrete) walkways and pads, minor grading variations to create berms and mounds, informal play field suitably sized for one large soccer game or two bantam games, Tot lot and Adventure play area, Picnic/gathering area sized for 25-30 people (including bar-be-que).

The Master Plan also includes the following which are not funded at this time: Picnic shelter to cover about four tables Water-play feature, Space has been reserved for a small restroom should the desire and funding ever occur. Parking will be provided at the curb on all four sides of the park. Lighting may be provided to the shade structure, and possibly for path lights, but is not anticipated for any type of after-dark field play lighting.

A multi-purpose (bicycle/pedestrian/utility maintenance) trail is proposed within the 100' freeway landscape buffer. Additionally, a multi-purpose (bicycle/pedestrian/utility maintenance) trail is proposed to connect the internal subdivision street with the intersection of Snowy Egret Blvd. / El Centro Road. The trail will meet the minimum illumination standards for public safety purposes.

Land Use:

The existing Zoning and Plan designations of the site are as follows:

Zoning: Agricultural Open Space, (A-OS-PUD)

- General Plan: Medium Density Residential (16-29 du/na), Low Density Residential (7-15 du/na), Mixed Use.
- North Natomas Community Plan: Medium Density Residential (7-21 du/na, target=12), High Density Residential (11-29+ du/na, target=22), Employment Center 65, Employment Center 40, and Freeway Buffer.

The project site is bordered on the north by Interstate 5, on the east by Del Paso Road, on the west by El Centro Road and in the south by Snowy Egret Blvd. and the Sundance Lake subdivision. The major arterials and freeways serving the project site are Del Paso Road, El Centro Road and Interstate 5.

Entitlements

The entitlements requested with this application are:

- A. **Negative Declaration**
- B. **Mitigation Monitoring Plan**
- C. **Development Agreement** between City and Cambay Group
- D. **General Plan Amendment** on 120± vacant acres from 61.2± acres of Mixed Use, 18.8± acres of medium density residential, 30.5± acres of low density residential, and 10.2± acres of Open Space to 28± acres of Mixed Use, 11.6± acres of Medium Density Residential, 17.3± acres of Open Space, 44.4 ± acres of Low Density Residential and 19.1± acres of High Density Residential.
- E. **North Natomas Community Plan Amendment** on 120± vacant acres from 7.0± acres of EC-65, 54.2± acres of EC-40, 18.8± acres of medium density residential, and 30.5± acres of medium density residential, to 7.5 ± acres of Employment Center 65; 20.5± acres of Employment Center 40; 19.1± acres of High Density; 11.6± acres of Medium Density; 44.4± acres of Low Density; and 17.3± acres of Open Space/Park.
- F. **Rezone** of 120± acres from A-OS, to 7.5± acres of EC 65-PUD; 20.5± acres of EC 40-PUD; 22.4± acres of R-1A-PUD; 22.0 ± acres of R-1-PUD, 11.6± acres of R-2A-PUD; 19.1 ± acres of R-3-PUD, and 16± acres of A-OS-PUD and 1.3± acres of Caltrans acquisition right of way.
- G. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the boundaries of the Neighborhood #9 Planned Unit Development (PUD) from 248.67± acres to 269.4± acres by adding a 20.8± acre portion of the project area.
- H. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the Gateway West PUD for

Cambay West Development.

- I. **Tentative Master Parcel Map** to subdivide 13 lots totaling 120± vacant acres (Lots A-K and Villages 1 & 2)
- J. **Tentative Subdivision Map** for 101 single family lots for Village #1; 109 single family lots for Village #2; Medium Density Residential Lots E and G; High Density Residential Lots C and D; Employment Center 40 Lot B; Employment Center 65 Lot A; Open Space-Freeway Corridor Lot H; Open Space - Park Lot F and Interstate 5 right of way (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication) Lot I.
- K. **Subdivision Modification** to allow a non-standard street section (47' width) adjacent to the proposed parksite.

In addition to the above entitlements, the City Council would need to ratify the negative declaration and adopt the mitigation monitoring plan.

Project Characteristics:

The proposed project consists of 120± vacant acres. The applicant proposes a Tentative Master Parcel Map to subdivide into 13lots (Lots A-K and Villages 1-2) and Tentative Subdivision Map for 210 single family lots for Villages #1 and #2; Medium Density Residential Lots E and G; High Density Residential Lots C and D; Employment Center 40 Lot B; Employment Center 65 Lot A; Open Space-Freeway Corridor Lot H; Open Space - Park Lot F and Interstate 5 right of way (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication) Lot I .

General Plan modification: The project, as proposed, includes a modification of land uses as described in the entitlements above and as reflected in table 1 below:

Table 1: Comparison of General Plan with Applicant’s Proposal

Land Use	General Plan Land Use Acreage	Proposed Area
Low Density Residential	30.5	44.4
Medium Density Residential	18.8	11.6
High Density Residential	-----	19.1
Mixed Use	61.2	28.0
Open Space – OS	10.2	17.3
Total	120±	120±

Community Plan modification: The project, as proposed, includes a modification of land uses as described in the entitlements above and as reflected in table 2 below:

Table 2: Comparison of North Natomas Community Plan with Applicant’s Proposal

Land Use	NNCP Land Use Acreage	Proposed Area
Low Density Residential	0.0	44.4
Medium Density Residential	26.5	11.6
High Density Residential	18.2	19.1
Employment Center 65	8.0	7.5
Employment Center 40	57.3	20.5
Open Space	0.0	17.3
Total	120	120

* *Modifications in Zoning:* The project, as proposed, would rezone the existing 120 acres from Agriculture / Open Space to the zoning classifications that correspond with the Community Plan entitlements and as reflected in Table 3 below:

Table 3: **Comparison of Existing Zoning with Applicant's Proposal**

Zoning Classification	Existing Zoning Area	Proposed Area
R-1-PUD: Low Density Residential	0	22.0
R-1A-PUD: Low Density Residential	0	22.4
R-2A-PUD: Medium Density Residential	0	11.6
R-3-PUD: High Density Residential	0	19.1
EC-65-PUD: Employment Center 65	0	7.5
EC-40-PUD: Employment Center 40	0	20.5
AOS-PUD	120	16.0
CalTrans Acquisition	N/A	1.3
Total	120	120

Building square footage and use: Only the land use entitlements are being sought at this time. No buildings square footage or specific usage are included as part of this application.

Number of employees: The developer anticipates there to be approximately 1,070 employees, based upon an estimated 65 employees per net acre of EC-65 and 45 employees per net acre of EC-40.

Development Agreement: All developments in North Natomas are required to enter into a Development Agreement with the City. Pursuant to the provisions of Government Code 65865 *et seq.*, the development agreements are designed to cause the implementation of the City's General Plan and North Natomas Community Plan. The landowner is thereby committed to funding its appropriate share of the cost of infrastructure and other facilities which are the subject of the North Natomas Finance Plan. The

form Development Agreement, approved by the City Council on August 9, 1994, (Resolution No. 94-494), has been used by the applicant and the exhibits have been provided for the specific project.

Inclusionary Housing Plan: All new residential developments in new growth areas (e.g., North Natomas) for which legislative entitlement applications were filed after the adoption of the Mixed Income Policy, are subject to an Inclusionary Housing Plan which requires a percentage of the housing units in the development to be affordable to very low (and low) income households. The Inclusionary Housing Plan is submitted with the land use application and is scheduled for adoption concurrent with the other entitlements.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT BACKGROUND

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration of Environmental Effects contains an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed project. Some of this analysis is "tiered" from the environmental analysis contained in previously prepared environmental documents.

The CEQA concept of "tiering" refers to the coverage of general environmental matters in a broad Program Level EIR, with subsequent focused environmental documents prepared for individual projects that implement the program. The project environmental document incorporates by reference the discussion(s) in the Program EIR and concentrates on project-specific issues. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered environmental documents to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. This is accomplished in tiered documents by eliminating repetitive analyses of issues that were adequately addressed in the Program EIR and by incorporating those analyses by reference.

In accordance with CEQA Section 15152, the environmental analysis for the proposed project is tiered from the following documents:

Sacramento General Plan Update Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse #86101310);

1994 North Natomas Community Plan Supplement to the 1986 North Natomas Community Plan Environmental Impact Report (1994 NNCP SEIR) (State Clearinghouse # 93012011);

Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the 1994 North Natomas Community Plan.

1986 North Natomas Community Plan Environmental Impact Report (1986 NNCP EIR) (State Clearinghouse #93012011);

The documents listed above are hereby incorporated by reference and available for review during normal office hours at the City of Sacramento Planning Division, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

Sacramento General Plan Update

The SGPU DEIR assesses the environmental impacts of build-out of the Sacramento General Plan Update. The City Council has evaluated these impacts and has adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the General Plan Update. This initial study for the proposed project relies on the Sacramento General Plan Update DEIR for a comprehensive analysis of animal life, plant life, traffic, noise, air quality, and cultural resource impacts.

North Natomas Community Plan Update

The North Natomas Community Plan Update Supplemental EIR assesses the environmental impacts of build-out of the North Natomas area. The City Council has evaluated these impacts and has adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the North Natomas Community Plan Update. This initial study for the proposed project relies on the North Natomas Community Plan Update SEIR for a comprehensive analysis of animal life, plant life, traffic, noise, air quality, and cultural resource impacts.

This Initial Study should be viewed in conjunction with the SGPU and North Natomas Community Plan Update EIRs. The purpose of this Initial Study is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project with respect to these EIRs to determine what level of additional environmental review, if any, is appropriate. Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, one of the following determinations will be made:

- * The project incrementally contributes to, but does not exceed, environmental impacts previously identified in these EIRs, no additional mitigation measures are required, and preparation of Findings consistent with this determination is appropriate;
- * The project would result in new impacts that were not previously identified in these EIRs, but there is no substantial evidence that such new impacts may have a significant effect on the environment and preparation of a Negative Declaration is appropriate;
- * The project would result in new potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in these EIRs, but proposed project-specific mitigation measures would reduce such impacts to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur and there is no substantial evidence that the project as mitigated may have a significant effect on the environment, in which case preparation of a mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate;
- * The project would result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified in these EIRs, and preparation of a tiered EIR would be appropriate.

Mitigation measures identified in these EIRs that apply to the proposed project will be required to be implemented as part of the project. The mitigation measures in these EIRs that are appropriate to be implemented as part of the project are identified and discussed in Section IV.

IV. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH TIERING DOCUMENTS

In order to determine the consistency of the proposed project with the SGPU EIR and the North Natomas Community Plan Update EIR, the following questions must be answered:

Is the proposed project included within the scope of the development (or alternatives) projected by these EIRs?
Is the project's proposed land use consistent with the type of use designated and analyzed by these EIRs?

The following discussion analyzes the consistency of the land use designations of the proposed project and the existing plans (the land use designations are also discussed in Section II above). The land use designations that were studied in the previous environmental documents assumed Employment Center 30 uses (e.g. mixture of predominately warehouse with office, and some retail. This proposal is in conformity with that assumption. Any potential impacts of the amended designations will be discussed below (Section V).

V. TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The Checklist Form provided below identifies the following impact categories for the Proposed Project: 1) potentially significant project impacts not fully addressed in prior EIRs that may not be mitigated by incorporation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measures; 2) potentially significant impacts not fully addressed in prior EIRs which could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by incorporation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measures; 3) impacts which would be less-than-significant through implementation of Mitigation Measures adopted in prior EIRs; and 4) effects which would result in no new impacts not already addressed in prior EIRs.

This section also contains an explanation of all checklist answers, and recommended Program EIR Mitigation Measures, as appropriate. For this checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Less-than-Significant Impact: Any impact that would not be considered under CEQA relative to existing standards.

No Impact: The project would not have any impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING.			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	☐	☐	■
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	☐	☐	■
d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	☐	☐	■
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	☐	☐	■

Discussion

The proposed project site is designated in the Sacramento General Plan Update as Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Mixed Use. The site is currently zoned 120 acres of Agricultural Open Space (A-OS).

Proposed Uses

The applicant is proposing to rezone the site to 22 gross acres Standard Single Family-PUD (R-1-PUD), 22.4 gross acres Alternative Single Family-PUD (R-1A-PUD), 11.6 gross acres of Multi-Family-PUD (R-2A-PUD), 19.1 gross acres Multi-Family-PUD (R-3-PUD), 20.5 gross acres Employment Center 40-PUD (EC-PUD), 7.5 gross acres Employment Center 65-PUD (EC-PUD); 16 gross acres Agriculture Open Space/Freeway Buffer-PUD (AOS-PUD) and 1.3 gross acres of Caltrans acquisition right of way to correspond to the proposed General Plan and Community Plan designations.

A General Plan Amendment and Community Plan Amendment are requested because the applicant wishes to make modifications to the land use plan of the North Natomas Community Plan. The changes to the land use plan proposes to delete medium density residential and employment center, while adding low density residential.

The applicant is also requesting a Tentative Master Parcel Map to subdivide 13 parcels (Villages 1-2 and Lots

A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J & K), which include 2 parcels for low density single family residential uses (Villages 1-2), 2 parcels for medium density single family residential (Lots E and G), 2 parcels for high density residential (Lots C and D), 2 parcels for Employment Center 65 and 40 (Lots A and B respectively), 3 parcels for open space – neighborhood park, freeway buffer and for dedication (Lots F, H & I) and 2 parcels for drainage and sewer easements Lots J & K).

PROPOSED MASTER PARCEL MAP

PARCEL	LAND USES	GROSS ACREAGE
A	Employment Center - 65	7.5±
B	Employment Center - 40	18.7±
C	High Density - Residential 22 du/na	11.0±
D	High Density - Residential 22 du/na	8.1±
E	Medium Density - Residential 12 du/na	6.3±
F	Open Space - Neighborhood Park	6.4±
G	Medium Density - Residential 12 du/na	5.3±
H	Open Space - Freeway Buffer	8.9±
I	I-5 Ultimate Widening	1.3±
J	Drainage Easement	0.7±
K	Sewer Easement	0.08±
Village 1	Low Density - Residential 7 du/na	21.7±
Village 2	Low Density - Residential 7 du/na	20.2±
	TOTAL	120±

Lot H (Open Space Freeway Buffer) will include a drainage basin canal and conjunctive use maintenance road and trail.

A Development Agreement and a PUD Designation, including the approval of the Schematic Plan and Development Guidelines, are being requested with this application. Special Permits will be sought at the time land is sold to developers. An approved Special Permit will be required prior to construction of any building on the site.

According to the SGPU EIR, the proposed project is located within an area designated as Prime Agricultural soil (SGPU EIR, T-17). The conversion of these lands from agriculture to urban uses has already been identified, and the impacts were overridden by the City Council with the adoption of the SGPU EIR and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING.			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Between 1975 and 1989, the population in the North Natomas area increased by 88%. This, however, is not remarkable when the actual figures reveal that housing increased from 178 dwelling units.

The development proposes to have a total of 702 dwelling units. The increase in the number of units was generally anticipated in the NNCP.

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL LAND USES

LAND USE	GROSS ACREAGE	DWELLING UNITS
High Density - Residential 22 du/na	19.1±	339
Medium Density - Residential 12 du/na	11.6±	108
Low Density - Residential: 45' x 105' lot size (100 lots)	20.2±	100
Low Density - Residential: 60' x 105' lot size (65 lots)	21.7±	65
Low Density - Residential: 67' x 105' lot size (45 lots)*	incl. above	90
TOTAL	75.1±	702

* The low density residential 67' x 105' lots are sized to accommodate "granny units" - second residential units. Applicant

has designated 45 of the 90 lots for granny units. The Planned Unit Development Guidelines will require the provision of granny units in order to maximize the number of housing units. This “blending” of densities is intended to satisfy the City Council’s direction to introduce higher densities into the low density residential areas by the use of halfplexes, duplexes, or granny flats.

PROPOSED MEDIUM & HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CALCULATIONS

LAND USE	GROSS ACREAGE	NET ACREAGE	TARGET AVERAGE DENSITY	# DWELLING UNITS
High Density - Residential	19.1±	15.4±	22	339
Medium Density - Residential	11.6±	9.0±	12	108

Residential Yield of Existing North Natomas Community Plan

LAND USE	GROSS ACREAGE	ASSUMED NET ACREAGE	TARGET AVERAGE DENSITY	# DWELLING UNITS
High Density - Residential	18.2±	15.8±	22	347
Medium Density - Residential	26.5±	22.5±	12	270
Low Density Residential	0.0	0.0	7	0
Residential Total	44.7			617

Note: The North Natomas Community Plan (p. 12) estimates that gross acres can be converted into net acres by using a set of factors that account for minor roads. These factors are: 82% for low density residential, 85% for medium density residential, and 87% for high density residential. These factors are only estimates, and will vary in practice depending on the specific circumstances of the land area. Also, these factors assume that the major roads have already been removed. In fact, the major roads were not already removed from the assumed gross acreage. Because of these facts, the above table probably overstates the residential yield that would have resulted from buildout of the adopted Community Plan.

Residential Comparison of North Natomas Community Plan with Applicant’s Proposal

Land Use	NNCP Land Use Dwelling Units	Proposed Dwelling Units
Low Density Residential	0	210
Low Density Residential - Granny Units	n/a	45

Medium Density Residential	270	108
High Density Residential	347	339
Total	617	702

Inclusionary Housing Plan: On the date of June 20, 2000, the City Council adopted a Mixed Income Housing policy, as part of its Housing Element of the General Plan. That policy was implemented by adoption of a Mixed Income Housing Ordinance (2000-039) on October 3, 2000, that established what is commonly called an inclusionary housing program. Chapter 17.190, added to Title 17 (Zoning) of the City Code, sets forth specific information on the requirements and operation of the program. The purpose of the program is to assist the City in achieving a diverse and balanced community with housing available for households of all income levels. The Ordinance generally applies to all residential development applications in new growth areas filed after the adoption of the Mixed Income Policy.

The Ordinance requires that 5% of all residential units in a real estate development project that includes market rate housing, must be affordable to and occupied by low income households. A low income household is one whose gross income does not exceed 80% of the Sacramento median income, adjusted for family size. A unit whose occupancy is restricted to a low income household has a monthly rent that does not exceed one-twelfth of 30% of 80% of the Sacramento area median income, adjusted for family size. The Ordinance also requires that 10% of all residential units in a real estate development project that includes market rate housing, must be affordable to and occupied by very low income households. A very low income household is one whose gross income does not exceed 50% of the Sacramento median income, adjusted for family size. A unit whose occupancy is restricted to a very low income household has a monthly rent that does not exceed one-twelfth of 30% of 50% of the Sacramento area median income, adjusted for family size.

As part of the legislative entitlements for the development project, section 17.190.110(A) of the City Code requires an Inclusionary Housing Plan setting forth the number, unit mix, location, structure type affordability and phasing of the inclusionary units in the residential development. All future approvals for the development project, including final maps, subsequent tentative maps, special permits, and development plan reviews shall be consistent with the Inclusionary Housing Plan.

The Inclusionary Requirement for the residential project will be set forth in more detail in the Inclusionary Housing Agreement, to be executed by and between the developer and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency, and shall be recorded against all the residential land in the Development Project. This Agreement will describe with particularity the site and building schematics and financial arrangements for the construction and financing of the Inclusionary units, pursuant to Section 17.190.110C.

Because the Cambay West project was processed contemporaneously with the hearing and approval process for the Mixed Income Ordinance, the City Council made a determination specific to the project that the mixed income requirement for Cambay West would consist solely of 10% very low income units, and the entitlements for the project are conditioned accordingly.

Employment

Additionally, the proposed mixed use (Employment Centers 40 & 65) project is not anticipated to substantially alter the location, distribution, density or growth rate of the human population or generate significant additional demand for housing. A total of 1,070 employees are proposed by the project on 26.2 gross acres (23 net acres). This is substantially less than the NNCP provision for employment in the area.

Employment Yield of Proposed Land Uses

LAND USE	NET ACREAGE	TARGET INTENSITY	# EMPLOYEES
Employment Center - 65	6.0±	65	390
Employment Center - 40	17.0±	40	680
Employment Total	23.0±		1,070

Employment Yield of Existing North Natomas Community Plan

LAND USE	GROSS ACREAGE	ASSUMED NET ACREAGE	TARGET INTENSITY	# EMPLOYEES
Employment Center - 65	8.0±	7.0±	65	455
Employment Center - 40	57.3±	50.4±	40	2,016
Employment Total	65.3±			2,471

Note: The North Natomas Community Plan (p. 12) estimates that gross acres can be converted into net acres by using a set of factors that account for minor roads. These factors are: 88% for employment center. These factors are only estimates, and will vary in practice depending on the specific circumstances of the land area. Also, these factors assume that the major roads have already been removed. In fact, the major roads were not already removed from the assumed gross acreage. Because of these facts, the above table probably overstates the employment yield that would have resulted from buildout of the adopted Community Plan.

The loss of 42.3 employment center acres would result in a potential loss of approximately 1,350 employees.

The jobs/housing ratio is calculated as the number of projected housed workers (assuming 1.35 workers per dwelling unit) divided by the number of projected employees. The 1994 NNCP states that a 70 percent

P99-135 Negative Declaration

jobs/housing ratio is "projected" in the City portion of North Natomas. The various amendments to the North Natomas Community Plan have resulted in a drift toward fewer housing units and fewer jobs projected at buildout. In fact, the number of housing units have declined more than the number of jobs, resulting in a slight imbalance towards too many jobs relative to housing units. The loss of jobs and increase in housing units for Cambay West actually restores the overall jobs/housing balance closer to the 70% target.

NORTH NATOMAS MONITORING - JOBS/HOUSING

Project	HOUSING	JOBS	
BASELINE (NNCP CITY PORTION)	30,168	58,184	70.00%
AMENDMENTS			
P95-028: Del Paso Rd PUD	0	533	
P95-074: Natomas MarketPlace	(198)	(971)	
P95-085: Northborough	279	0	
P96-058: Northpointe Park	312	60	
P96-083: Alleghany #2	-220	-115	
P96-106: Gateway West	-837	-1622	
P97-013: Parkway Plaza	-129	18	
P98-041: Schumacher	-150	853	
P98-046: Gateway North	32	-79	
P98-079: Riverview #1	(7)	(49)	
P98-080: Riverview #2	(50)	0	
P98-112: Westborough	-154	-1334	
P99-066: Northborough II	-349	-120	
P99-077: Northpointe Park	-73	-79	
P99-128: Creekside	47	82	
P99-132: Goldenland	(533)	1,604	
P00-001: Westborough Mods	17	15	
P00-019: Northborough II	25	0	
TOTAL AMENDMENTS	(1,988)	(1,204)	
SUBTOTAL: ADOPTED	28,180	56,980	66.77%
NON-AMENDMENT CHANGES			
P98-033: Arena Corporate Center	0	70	
P98-042: Arena Commons	296	(676)	
P98-078: The Club	(55)	10	
P99-043: Natomas Crossing - 22/23	(60)	0	
P99-084: Northpointe Charter School	(130)	(90)	
P99-142: Terracina Gold	286	(438)	

TOTAL OTHER CHANGES	337	(1,124)	
ADJUSTED NNCP	28,518	55,856	68.93%
P99-135: Cambay West	85	(1,350)	
ADJUSTED W/ CAMBAY WEST	28,603	54,506	70.84%

Based on the foregoing analyses, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a less-than-significant impact upon population and housing.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

3. GEOLOGY.

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fault rupture? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Seismic ground failure including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Landslides or mudflows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Subsidence of the land? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Expansive soils? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Unique geologic or physical features? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

The proposed project will result in compaction and over covering of soil to provide proper drainage, building foundation, parking, and vehicular maneuvering area. The Sailboat-Scribner-Cosumnes and Clear Lake soil types predominates in North Natomas. These are very deep, somewhat poorly and poorly-drained soils that have a seasonal high water table and are protected by levees. The Clear Lake soil type have a somewhat more clayey texture (SGPU EIR, T-4-5). The City of Sacramento is in the heart of one of the most productive

agricultural regions in the world and contains extensive acreage of prime agricultural soils (SGPU EIR, T-17). According to the SGPU, the proposed project is located within an area designated as Prime Agricultural soil (SGPU EIR, T-17).

Cities in California are required to consider seismic safety as part of the General Plan safety elements. The City of Sacramento also recognizes that it is prudent for the City to prepare for seismic related hazards and has, therefore, adopted policies as a part of the General Plan, Health and Safety Element. These policies require that the City protect lives and property from unacceptable risk due to seismic and geologic activity or unstable soil conditions to the maximum extent feasible, that the City prohibit the construction of structures for permanent occupancy across faults, that soils reports and geologic investigations be required for multiple story buildings, and that the Uniform Building Code requirements that recognize State and federal earthquake protection standards in construction be used. The policies listed above are implemented through the building permit process for new construction projects and reduce the potential significant health and safety impacts. According to the 1986 NNCP EIR (page K-5), the site lies within Seismic Zone "2" (Zone 0 represents least damage with most damage occurring in Zone 3). No active faults are known to be located on the property. The closest faults are the Bear Mountain fault zone about 25 miles to the east, the Melones fault zone 40 miles to the east and the Midland fault zone about 25 miles to the west. Strong ground shaking can be expected in the area in the event of a large or moderate earthquake on any of the nearby faults. Strong ground shaking can cause damage to structures and infrastructure and ground failure, such as liquefaction or lurching, can result from strong ground shaking. Development within the SGPU area is subject to potential damage from earthquake groundshaking at a maximum intensity of VIII of the Modified Mercalli Scale (SGPU EIR, T-16).

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if it allows a project to be built that will introduce geologic, soils, or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City Planning and Building Department requires a site-specific soil investigation (including detailed analyses of surface and subsurface conditions, per Uniform Building Code) for individual structures proposed for development. The information from this soil investigation is then incorporated into the site-specific engineering and seismic designs for the proposed structures as required by the Planning and Building Department. Satisfaction of these Planning and Building Department conditions is required prior to the issuance of building permits. If the potential for geologic, soils, or seismic hazards exists on the site, the Planning and Building Department will require that the UBC standards be met in order to ensure proper design to mitigate potential impacts.

The City requires that all new structures be designed to withstand this intensity level. Thus, for the purposes of this environmental analysis, the potential for a significant geology, soils, and seismic impact created by construction of the project has been substantially lessened by the use of regulatory requirements.

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant geologic and seismic impacts.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact
4. WATER.			
<i>Would the proposal result in:</i>			
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Flood Protection

Setting

North Natomas is located in the lower portion of the Sacramento Valley and is part of what is known as the American River Basin in the floodplain of the Sacramento River. Flooding occurred regularly prior to human influence in the area; much of the area probably was seasonal wetlands, interspersed with some perennial lakes. One such former lake, Bush Lake, is shown in 1911 and 1915 topographic maps which include the area in the southeast corner of the incorporated portion of the NNCP area (NNCP EIR, page M-1).

Existing drainage and flooding conditions in the valley are quite different from those which existed prior to human settlement. Specifically, as land was reclaimed for agricultural production, natural features were altered significantly. In 1911, Reclamation District 1000 (RD 1000) was created to provide facilities to alleviate periodic flooding. RD 1000 is responsible for building, maintaining, and operating the major canals, levees, and pumping plants in North Natomas. The construction of the Sacramento River levee system in the early 1900s was by far the most dramatic human modification of the regional hydrology. The elimination of the overbank flow from the Sacramento River and the drain and levee system constructed by RD 1000 and companion reclamation districts bordering the river, combined to reduce the expansive riparian forests and seasonal wetlands which previously had dominated much of the Sacramento Valley (NNCP EIR, page M-2).

Flooding

A99 to X Flood Zone: When the NNCP EIR and SEIR were adopted, the proposed project was located within an area of the 100-year floodplain designated as the A-99 flood zone on the Sacramento Community's Official Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) dated November 15, 1989. Since the adoption of the EIR and SEIR, the North Area Local Project, a flood control project carried out by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), was completed. As of July 6, 1998, the FIRMs show North Natomas, including the project site, in the X zone, outside the 100-year floodplain.

The North Area Local Project was initiated in 1993 and completed in 1997. This project improved the levees and flood control systems along the Natomas Cross Canal (the northern boundary of the Natomas Basin in which North Natomas is located), Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal (NEMDC), and lower Dry and Arcade Creeks. The Local Project was completed at a cost of \$60 million - see SAFCA Capital Improvement Equalization Fee below. When designed, the North Area Local Project did not assume increased upstream storage capacity on the American River through either reoperation of Folsom Dam or construction of a new upstream facility (Auburn Dam). Further, the design assumed 100-year flows on the tributaries and streams and the levees were designed to withstand a flow of 180,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). As a result, notwithstanding the US Corps of Engineers reevaluation of the hydrology of the American River basin based on incorporation of 1997 flood information, the North Area Local Project improvements provide 100-year flood protection. The City submitted Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) applications in December, 1996, for North Sacramento and the Natomas Basin and submitted CLOMR applications for Dry Creek and the NEMDC in August 1997. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has issued the Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) certifying that these levees provide 100-year flood protection. North Natomas, South Natomas, and portions of North Sacramento were removed from the A-99 zone and redesignated within the X zone when FEMA published the FIRMs on July 6, 1998.

SAFCA Capital Improvement Equalization Fee: The project is located within the North Area Local Project Capital Assessment District No. 2 and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) Capital Improvement Equalization Fee (CIEF) area. Therefore, the property owner will be required to pay the special benefit assessment and the CIEF based on the proposed land use and building intensity.

Comprehensive Flood Management Plan: On February 13, 1996, the City Council approved the city-wide Comprehensive Flood Management Plan (CFMP) and approved a resolution that would lift flood related development restrictions in Natomas once certain conditions were met. The CFMP establishes Residential and Non-Residential Development Guidelines (Section 8 of the CFMP) for buildings within an area that has less than 200-year flood protection. Once 200 year or better flood protection is provided, the development guidelines will be reviewed and perhaps modified to reflect the improved flood protection.

Although the proposed project is outside the 100-year floodplain, the following development guidelines pursuant to the CFMP will be placed on the proposed development to ensure adequate flood protection:

- Provide multiple access points in subdivisions that are 10 acres or larger in size to facilitate evacuation and other emergency services;
- New residential subdivisions shall either identify refuge areas to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Department or ensure that at least 50 percent of all residential units shall have a top plate above the base flood elevation;
- Major projects (40,000 square feet or larger) shall have second story construction or roof access and a top plate above the base flood elevation in order to provide adequate refuge areas. Refuge areas at private structures should be required to accommodate employees only;
- All residential and non-residential structures must be anchored to their foundations per regulations in the City Building Code;
- Gas valve shut-off keys must be attached in a visible location for all residential and commercial gas water heaters; and
- Special facilities, such as hospitals and elder care facilities, shall be required to implement flood safety measures in their designs to the satisfaction of the City Neighborhoods, Planning and Building Services Department.

IMPACT:

With the provision of an adequate stormwater drainage system and compliance with the Comprehensive Floodplain Management Plan Development Guidelines, the proposed project is expected to have a less-than-significant water impact.

Anticipated Ground Water Impacts

Ground water conditions may impact development of the site depending upon when construction is planned.

Water levels in the Natomas West Drainage Canal (south of the site) and beneath the project site are influenced by seasonal weather conditions. Buried structures such as underground fuel tanks may be subjected to buoyancy forces that must be considered in design. If underground tanks are needed on the proposed project site, future tenants shall be required to obtain an underground tank permit from the County of Sacramento (Sacramento County Code No. 0716). In this instance, the City's Fire Department will conduct site visits to ensure that permitting requirements are followed (City Ordinance No. 88-012).

An environmental site assessment conducted for another project site within the North Natomas Community Plan (Northpointe Park) recommends that, if ground water below the property is intended as a potable source of water, the water should be sampled and analyzed from the existing agricultural supply well and in order to evaluate ground water for potential contaminants not visible from the visual reconnaissance or data review. If the wells are not to be used, they should be properly abandoned.

Seasonal Water

If earthwork is undertaken during the winter or spring months, the upper soils likely will be saturated due to the topography and the impervious nature of the shallow subsurface soils. Grading operations should be scheduled to avoid fill construction during this period as soils may be too saturated to be properly compacted; also, equipment access most likely will be impeded.

Drainage

The proposed project would increase the runoff volumes generated by the property. The impervious surfaces of residential and non-residential development would require an on-site storm drain system which would deliver runoff from the site to the West Natomas Drainage Canal.

Water Quality

The proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it resulted in a substantial degradation of water quality. Impacts to water quality are considered significant if they violate water quality objectives as set forth by the California Water Resources Control Board. The goal of these objectives is to protect public health and protect the beneficial uses of water bodies covered by this plan.

The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board under the requirements of the EPA and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The purpose of this permit is to reduce pollutants found in urban stormwater runoff. The City has generated a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to accomplish this goal. The primary focus of the BMPs is to implement measures to reduce non-point source pollutants being discharged into waterways. Components of the Best Management Practices include:

- Maintenance of structures and roads
- Flood control management
- Comprehensive development plans
- Erosion and sediment control ordinances
- Inspection and enforcement procedures
- Educational programs for management of hazardous materials spill prevention, and control programs

The terms and conditions of the NPDES permit apply to all projects in the City which have the potential to affect the water quality in open waterways, and will ensure that the proposed project does not create a significant impact upon water quality.

The project is required to provide source control post-construction stormwater quality control measures to minimize the increase in urban run-off pollution caused by development. In addition, all grading activities associated with the site development are required to comply with the City's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance 93-068). This ordinance will require project applicants to prepare erosion, sediment, and pollution control plans for both during and after construction of a proposed project, and preliminary and final grading plans. With the adherence to these standards, less-than-significant water quality impacts due to grading are anticipated.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

5. AIR QUALITY.

Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create objectionable odors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

A less-than-significant air quality impact is anticipated to result from the proposed project. However, traffic associated with the ultimate use of the development will produce emissions of various compounds that contribute to regional and local air quality problems.

Setting - Air Quality

In order to gauge the significance of the air quality impacts of a proposed project, those impacts,

together with existing background air quality levels, must be compared to the applicable ambient air quality standards. These standards are the levels of air quality considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. They are designed to protect those people most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics or the elderly.

Air pollutants are often characterized as being primary or secondary. Primary pollutants, such as Carbon Monoxide (CO), are emitted directly into the atmosphere and are usually associated with congested traffic conditions. Carbon Monoxide is primarily a winter period pollution problem. The SGPU EIR states that motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in most problem areas (Z-17). The SGPU EIR also states that CO problems are usually localized, often the result of a combination of high traffic volumes and significant traffic congestion (Z-17).

Secondary pollutants are formed through chemical reactions in the atmosphere. These chemical reactions usually involve primary pollutants, normal constituents of the atmosphere, and other secondary pollutants exposed to sunlight. These compounds, which react to form secondary pollutants, are often referred to as reactive pollutant precursors or precursor emission products. Photochemical smog is a diverse group of secondary pollutants. A major component of photochemical smog is ozone which results from a complex reaction of primary pollutants, reactive organic gases (ROG's) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). Because of the nature of smog formation, it is considered a regional problem, generally not attributable to one particular project. Ozone problems have been identified as the cumulative result of regional development patterns, rather than the result of a few incrementally significant emission sources (SGPU EIR, Z-9). The main source of photochemical smog in Sacramento is automobile emissions.

The 1986-2006 SGPU DEIR identified urban emission sources as the primary source for existing air quality problems (Z-6). The document states that federal air quality standards for Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) are being exceeded several times per year in Sacramento County. Sacramento is a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO) and PM-10 (particulate matter 10 microns or smaller in size). Ozone levels and localized carbon monoxide increases in the Sacramento region, resulting from traffic associated with the SGPU buildout, represent unavoidable significant adverse impacts (SGPU EIR, Z-60 and Z-67). A Statement of Findings and Overriding Considerations was adopted by the City Council for the 1986-2006 SGPU. Specific ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), and PM-10 impacts are discussed below.

Vehicles associated with the project will produce those emissions that contribute to regional ozone and localized CO air quality impacts. Traffic originating within the NNCP area produced one (1) percent of the City generated traffic emissions in 1986, and is expected to generate 10.5 percent at SGPU buildout (SGPU EIR, Z-16, Z-61). The highest predicted worst case 8-hour average CO concentrations are in the range of 7-15 ppm (parts per million) at the intersection of I-5 and I-80. The highest predicted worst case 1-hour average CO concentrations are in the range of 10-22 ppm at the same location (SGPU EIR, Z-68). The federal and state standards for CO are as follows:

Carbon Monoxide Standards

<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>PPM</u>
8-hour	8-hour	9
1-hour	-	35
-	1-hour	20

The net increase in regional emissions of carbon monoxide and reactive organic gases (ROG's), which contribute to ozone, are described as being significant environmental effects (86 NNCP FEIR, pg. 24). The City Council found that these emissions are significant environmental effects that would arise from the cumulative development of North Natomas in the absence of appropriate and feasible mitigation measures.

The 1986 NNCP EIR, certified in 1986, identified three mitigation measures related to air quality: 1) Implement requirements for the Air Quality Plan (Air Quality Mitigation Strategy) for new developments; 2) Implement transportation control measures such as incentives for ride-sharing, transit, and bicycle use; and 3) Implement land use measures which would reduce the number of vehicle trips. Such measures include mixed land uses which provide housing within walking distance of employment centers and development of housing with prices compatible with the salary structure of major local employers. (NNCP DEIR pg. B-21-24) The project will be required to submit an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy (AQMS) and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Plan in compliance with those measures.

The 1994 NNCP SEIR sets forth additional air quality mitigation measures. The requirement of implementing an AQMS and a TSM Plan was restated as well as the following guiding policies that serve as mitigation measures:

- Development in North Natomas shall comply with the Federal and the California Clean Air Acts. (NNCP pg.48)
- Structure the community and each development to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips. (NNCP pg. 48)
- Minimize air quality impacts through direct street routing, providing a support network for zero-emission vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, and sizing streets suitable to the distance and speed of the traveler. (NNCP pg. 38)
- Provide commercial sites at transit stations/stops to make it easier for transit riders to shop on their commute rather than making a separate trip. (NNCP pg. 25)

The ability of the project to comply with these measures is discussed below in the Project Related Impacts.

The rapid growth and expansion experienced by the City of Sacramento over the past few years have contributed to the increased demand on our local transportation systems. This increased demand has resulted in traffic congestion, greater traffic volumes, and declining air quality. In an effort to mitigate the negative aspects of this increased demand, the City of Sacramento has enacted two Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinances. The purpose of TSM is to provide more efficient utilization of existing transportation facilities.

The Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Element and the required detailed Air Quality Mitigation Strategy of the North Natomas Community Plan were found to substantially lessen all the significant and potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from development of the North Natomas Community Plan area. The TSM element establishes a goal of 35 percent reduction in peak hour vehicle trips to assist in achieving an adequate level of service on North Natomas arterials. The Air Quality Mitigation Strategy establishes a community-wide goal of a 35 percent reduction in traffic and other related ROG's to assist in achieving and maintaining federal ozone standards.

Project Related Impacts

Transportation Systems Management (TSM Strategy): The proposed project will have an impact on existing air quality, with regard to increased automobile emissions. To reduce this impact, any non-residential development within the proposed project will be required to implement a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) strategy. The strategy helps make the maximum use of the existing transportation system, thus reducing the need for or delaying construction of new transportation facilities. TSM strategies work in several ways: 1) to reduce the number and length of vehicle trips, 2) to spread traffic throughout the day, or 3) to improve traffic flows. TSM measures are also intended to reduce air pollution levels. The TSM plan is a citywide requirement per the City Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 6 Section 1. The applicant may select from a menu of options that, used community-wide, will reduce peak hour trips by at least 35 percent. These options for non-residential uses include bike lockers and showers, carpool/ vanpool incentives, transit incentives, and others. Options for residential uses may include provision of bikes, transit incentives, neighborhood telecommute or carpool centers. A corresponding CO reduction would also be associated with the trip reduction for the project site. (Please see Section 6 below, Transportation and Circulation).

Air Quality Mitigation Strategy: Also, all development in the North Natomas Community Plan area is required to submit a project-wide Air Quality Mitigation Strategy to reduce the ROG emissions generated by the community. The North Natomas Community Plan contains an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy, which requires that projects in North Natomas be planned and developed in a way that reduces the community's reliance on single-occupant vehicles. Three types of measures are included in the strategy: 1) site design, 2) target area, and 3) community

wide. An example of a site design measure is the orientation of the building(s) to promote transit use. A target area measure might include the reduction in parking allowed because the site is located within 1/4 mile of a light rail station. And a community-wide measure might include provision of a shuttle system or formation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) for the community.

The City Planning and Building and Public Works Departments, with help from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), will verify that a 35 percent community-wide reduction in projected ROG emissions will result from successful implementation of the Air Quality Mitigation Strategy. All new residential development must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 20 percent compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline. And all non-residential development must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 50 percent compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline (NNCP SEIR). Promotion of electric, other zero-emission, and low-emission vehicle use is part of the Air Quality Mitigation Strategy. This NNCP requirement is in addition to the citywide requirement that all new non-residential developments prepare a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Plan.

Mixture of Land Uses: Per the 1986 NNCP EIR, a mixture of land uses is viewed as a benefit to reducing air quality because fewer trips may need to be made between activity centers. The proposed project is designated for a mixture of uses: residential, employment center, and open space uses. This mixture of land uses allows residents to work and shop within close proximity to their homes encouraging fewer and shorter trips.

Reduce Trips, Direct Street Routing and Ped/Bike/Low Emission Network: The Guiding Policies of the 1994 NNCP indicate that air quality can be improved by: 1) structuring each development to reduce trips, 2) providing direct street routing and pedestrian/bike/transit linkages, and 3) providing commercial services at light rail stations. To accomplish these improvements, the project and PUD guidelines shall ensure that buildings are close to the street and transit station/ stop; provide an on-street/ off-street bike system and a pedestrian network throughout the area; and encourage transit-serving employment center/office uses at the corner of El Centro and Del Paso Road. The nearest future light rail station is located off-site, across Interstate Freeway in the north western direction. Major bus routes could be linked with this station to provide transit services to the corner of El Centro and Del Paso Road where a future transit center is proposed.

Particulate Matter-10: Development of the site may result in short term particulate impacts. The Sacramento City Code (SCC, Article 9) states that any person who has been issued a building permit shall take responsible precautions to prevent and control movement of dust created by work activities. If a project is in violation of this article, the Building Official may order the work to be stopped (Sections 9.381, 9.382). Enforcement of these sections under the SCC will ensure that there is a less-than-significant PM-10 air quality impact.

Because the applicant must comply with these regulations and mitigation measures included in the NNCP EIR and SEIR pertaining to air quality, a less-than-significant air quality impact is anticipated by the project.

Mitigation Measure

- A. Comply with the NNCP's requirement to prepare an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy that reduces ROG emissions by 20 percent for residential uses and 50 percent for non-residential uses.

IMPACT:

The TSM Plan required for the project is expected to result in a minimum 35 percent decrease in peak hour vehicle trips compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline. The Air Quality Mitigation Strategy required for the project is expected to result in a minimum 35 percent community-wide (20 percent for residential and 50 percent for non-residential) decrease in Reactive Organic Gas (ROG) emissions when measured against the baseline conditions and to promote electric, other zero-emission, and low-emission vehicle use. Construction management practices related to reducing PM-10 are expected to reduce the impacts of PM-10 to a less-than-significant level. These decreases in trips and emissions are expected to reduce the proposed project's contribution to project specific and cumulative air quality impacts below a level of significance.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | □ | □ | ■ |
| g. Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | □ | □ | ■ |

Discussion

Traffic

The purpose of this traffic analysis is to determine if there will be any impacts at the El Centro Road/Road A intersection for the following:

- Westbound Road A traffic stacking and access conflicts to the EC 65 Employment Center Land use;
- Intersection Level of Service impacts and/or safety issues by allowing a southbound El Centro Road left turn pocket to travel eastbound to Road A.

Project Location

The project site is located at the southeast corner of the El Centro Road and Del Paso Road intersection. El Centro Road is the westerly boundary of the project site. The project will have direct access to El Centro Road. El Centro Road is currently a two-lane rural facility which traverses an agricultural area. El Centro Road has a posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour near the site. To the south, El Centro Road traverses a rural residential and agricultural area, and provides access to San Juan Road and West El Camino Road.

Del Paso Road is an east-west roadway which borders the northern portion of the site; while I-5 borders the eastern portion of the site. Del Paso Road provides access to I-5 via a full interchange. West of I-5, Del Paso Road is a two-lane rural roadway. East of I-5, it is four to six-lanes wide and provides access to Arco Arena. It continues easterly and provides access to northern portions of the City and County.

Level of Service

The operating conditions experienced by motorists are described as “levels of service” (LOS). LOS is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, including speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, driving comfort and convenience. LOS are designated “A” through “F” from best to worst, which cover the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS “A” through “E” generally represent traffic volumes at less than roadway capacity, while LOS “F” represents over capacity and/or forced flow conditions.

The City of Sacramento utilizes a LOS "C" goal for roadway operating conditions. Because of the constraints of existing development in the City, and because of other environmental concerns, this goal cannot always be met.

For traffic analysis purposes, the study area/key intersection was selected based upon anticipated volume of project traffic and the distributional patterns of the project traffic. The following intersection was identified:

El Centro Road and Road A (future road)

Existing Daily Operating Conditions

Field reconnaissance and review of recent traffic studies for adjacent development projects were performed. It was determined that the intersection currently meets or exceeds the City's LOS "C" goal.

Project Trip Generation

The trip generation characteristics for this project were estimated based on land use from the North Natomas Community Plan and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation, 6th Edition* (commonly referred to as the ITE Trip Generation Manual). The attached Cambay West Average Daily Traffic (ADT) table shows a comparison of the trips generated for the existing land use as well as the trips anticipated to be generated with the proposed land use utilizing the North Natomas Community Plan and ITE trip generators.

The trip generation results indicate that the proposed project would generate traffic volumes between 55%-60% less than originally anticipated for the existing North Natomas Community Plan land use. Thus, no detailed Level of Service traffic analysis is warranted for other adjacent intersections since no new impacts will occur based on the reduced trip generation.

Project Trip Distribution

The distribution of vehicle trips generated by the project on the local roadway system was estimated utilizing the regional travel model of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes

No new impacts will occur to the area based on the reduced trip generation of the proposed project. However, roadway improvements will be required for the project to keep the roadway network consistent with the North Natomas Community Plan. The required roadway improvements will be identified in the project conditions.

Future Conditions

Future traffic volumes were forecasted using the updated 2025 North Natomas Community Plan Traffic Model. This traffic model was utilized in the development of the North Natomas

Community Plan, and incorporates the land use and transportation systems associated with the Community Plan. Utilizing the trip generation, distribution projections, new roadway facilities, and roadway expansion to existing facilities, traffic volumes associated with the project were added to anticipated future traffic volumes to provide the basis for the traffic analysis.

Conclusion: Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The traffic analysis for the El Centro Road/Road A intersection revealed the following:

- I. No conflicts will occur between the westbound Road A traffic stacking and access to the EC 65 Employment Center Land use;
- II. Intersection Level of Service impacts and/or safety issues will likely occur by allowing a southbound El Centro Road left turn pocket to travel eastbound to Road A.

Therefore, no El Centro Road southbound left turn provision will be allowed to travel eastbound to Road A in order to ensure that there will be no Level of Service impacts and/or safety issues. Thus, no project mitigation measure is necessary.

An entitlement is also requested for a Subdivision Modification to allow a non-standard street cross-section adjacent to the proposed parksite. The proposed street cross-section has been reviewed by the Dept. of Public Works and has been determined to be safe and appropriate.

However, the project will be conditioned to provide roadway improvements as required by the North Natomas Community Plan. Therefore, since the proposed project is a less intensive trip generator as compared to the current land use in the North Natomas Community Plan, no additional impacts are expected.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion

The following information for the project area is based upon the Biological Resources Assessment & Analysis for the Proposed Cambay West Development prepared by Gibson & Skordal, Inc., dated October 10, 1999, and information in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) (November 1997). According to the site investigation by Gibson & Skordal, the property is currently fallow agricultural land that has been historically leveled and drained.

The 1986 NNCP EIR and the subsequent 1994 NNCP SEIR evaluated four distinct habitat types which exist in the North Natomas study area. These four habitat types are as follows: 1) Wooded Riparian/ Wetland, 2) Non-wooded Riparian/ Wetland, 3) Agricultural, and 4) Developed Areas. According to Exhibit N-2 - Vegetation Types in the 1986 NNCP EIR, dated 1985, the project area included agricultural- rice and agricultural- other and riparian/ wetland (few or no trees) along the existing East Drain. On the All Crops Map prepared by the Natomas Mutual Water Company, dated 1993, in the draft Natomas Basin HCP, the project area land cover is other farming (i.e., not rice).

Potential impacts on biological resources would result from direct and indirect disturbance of

wildlife and loss of wildlife and plant habitat from construction of the project area. Impacts on the following special status plants and animals may result from development of this project:

Special Status Plants: According to the 1986 NNCP EIR and the 1994 NNCP SEIR, based on field surveys, data search, and literature searches, four special status plant species could exist at the project site. These species are the Boggs Lake Hedge-Hysopp (*Gratiola heterosepala*), Palmate-bracted Bird's Beak (*Cordylanthus palmatus*), California Hibiscus (*Hibiscus californicus*), and Downingia (*Downingia humilis*). All four of these species are associated with wetland or vernal pool habitat types. According to the Biological Resources Assessment for the Cambay West site, none of the four species were found on the project site. The plants occurring on the site are primarily non-native ruderal species including yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), Wild oats (*Avena fatua*), soft hess (*Bromus mollis*), ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), vetch (*Vicia* sp.), and filaree (*Erodium* sp.). There are no trees or shrubs occurring on the property.

No mitigation measures related to special status plants are required for the project. Development of the site would create a less-than-significant impact on special status plants.

Special Status Animals: The following special status animals were studied in the 1986 NNCP EIR, the 1994 NNCP SEIR:

Giant Garter Snake (*Thamnophis couchi gigas*). The giant garter snake is designated a Threatened species by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). During the active season (generally March through October), these snakes bask on stream banks or drape on emergent and streamside vegetation. The giant garter snake is very aquatic, and will quickly retreat to water when alarmed. They feed on carp, bullfrogs, and other fish and amphibians. The snakes spend the winter in dormancy, inhabiting cracks and burrows above the high water line. The Biological Resources Assessment submitted by applicant indicates that the ditches along the southern and western edges of the property provide potential habitat for giant garter snakes (*Thamnophis gigas*).

The 1994 NNCP requires a Habitat Conservation Plan be approved to reduce the impacts of urban development on plants and animals in the community plan area. Impacts to the Giant Garter Snake would be less-than-significant because the project proponent is required to participate in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsonii*). The Swainson's hawk is listed as Threatened by the CDFG, and as a Category 3C Species by the USFWS. This hawk typically nests in oaks or cottonwoods in or near riparian areas (Schlorff and Bloom, 1984). Swainson's hawks prefer nesting habitats that provide nearby foraging grounds of grasslands, irrigated pasture, alfalfa, hay,

and wheat crops. The nesting season of the Swainson's hawk extends from late March through mid-July. Swainson's hawks have become almost entirely dependent on annual grassland and crops such as alfalfa for foraging habitat in California. Most of the native grasslands which formerly provided foraging habitat have been eliminated by agriculture and urbanization.

Gibson & Skordal indicate that although the site lacks trees for nesting and roosting by raptors, the fallow agricultural fields do provide suitable forage habitat for Swainson's hawks (*Buteo swainson*) nests, which have been reported west of the project site along the Sacramento River (CNDDDB, 1990). According to the CDFG records the property is within five miles of documented Swainson's hawk nests located along the Sacramento River. The site provided moderate to excellent foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawks during the summer nesting season (depending on crop type). There are no trees on the property that would serve as nesting trees for the Swainson's hawks and their activities. Impacts to the Swainson's hawk are expected to be less-than-significant.

The Biological Resources Assessment (Gibson & Skordal) did not observe the **Peregrine Falcon** (*Falco peregrinus*), **Black-shouldered Kite** (*Elanus caeruleus*), **Burrowing Owl** (*Athene cunicularia*), **Northern Harrier** (*Circus cyaneus*), **Long-billed Curlew** (*Numenius arquata*), **Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle** (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), **Northwestern Pond Turtle** (*Clemmys marmorata*) on the project site. The species are listed as endangered by CDFG and USFWS. There are no suitable nesting sites for these species on the property and thus, impacts to the species are expected to be less-than-significant.

A less-than-significant impact on the special status animals observed on the project site (**Giant Garter Snake & Swainson's Hawk**) is anticipated given the requirement that the proponent must participate in the Habitat Conservation Plan.

Jurisdictional Wetlands: According to the Biological Resources Assessment conducted by Gibson & Skordal, no vernal pool sites are found on the project area. There are irrigation/drainage ditches on the site that contain water for much of the year. These ditches are excluded from regulation as waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Because of this, even though the ditches have the requisite characteristics of wetlands, they are not jurisdictional. When an area has been identified as containing seasonal wetlands, there is typically a concern for special-status species that may reside in the seasonal wetlands. These species include Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp, California Linderiella, Longhorn Fairy Shrimp, Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp, and California Tiger Salamander. Due to the likelihood that there are no vernal pools on the site, it is very unlikely that these species will occur on the project site. A less-than-significant impact on wetlands is expected by the project.

Tree Resources: Assessment of the Biological Resources indicates that there are no trees and shrubs occurring on the property.

Habitat Conservation Plan: A Habitat Conservation Plan is a required mitigation measure of the 1994 NNCP SEIR. A Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), dated November 1997, published by the City of Sacramento (with Technical Analysis by Thomas Reid Associates), has been distributed for public review. The purpose of the HCP is to acquire, create, restore, enhance, and manage habitat land for endangered species to mitigate for habitat loss that could result from construction in the Natomas Basin. As proposed in the HCP, the acquisition, restoration, enhancement, and operation of habitat will be fully funded by developer fees and revenue from hunting and rice growing. The fee applies to future construction in the Natomas Basin. Development in the Natomas Basin will be required to participate in the HCP or otherwise fulfill obligations to the CDFG and/or USFWS to mitigate for habitat loss from urban development.

Because the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) calls for multi-species protection and has included the condition that the owner will agree to pay such lawful fees, taxes or assessments imposed through the use of development fees, impacts fees, fee districts, community facilities districts, assessment districts, or other similar fair equitable and appropriate mechanisms designed to address any species foraging habitat mitigation, and shall execute an agreement satisfactory to the City Attorney and suitable for recordation which obligates the owner, and successors in interest, to pay development fees or assessments or taxes, as and when enacted, imposed, or levied, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact upon animal species.

The following mitigation measures will apply to development on the project area, once approved: 1) short term construction impacts mitigation; 2) full participation in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Compliance with these mitigation measures outlined below is expected to result in a less-than-significant impact on plants and animals.

Mitigation Measures

- B. The applicant shall participate in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). At the time of grading permit, the applicant shall pay the necessary fee, based on Resolutions 97-459 and 97-508, adopted by the City Council on August 7, 1997 and September 2, 1997, respectively. [As of September 12, 2000, the current fee is \$3,941 per gross acre]. On December 31, 1997, the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service executed the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

The project applicant/developer shall comply with all requirements of an adopted HCP as required in the Natomas Community Plan EIR and any additional mitigation measures identified in the Natomas Basin HCP EIR/EIS and conditions in the ITPs issued by USFWS and CDFG.

The project applicant/developer shall enter into an agreement with the City of Sacramento which will provide inter alia, that no grading permit, building permit or notice to proceed will be issued unless and until the City adopts a revised HCP and is issued by both federal and state wildlife agencies. The agreement shall also provide that the project applicant will meet all conditions of and participate to the full extent in an adopted Natomas Basin HCP and issued ITPs, or they will pursue and receive individual Incidental Take Permits (ITPs) prior to issuance of any grading permit, building permit or Notice to Proceed. If the applicant/developer is issued an individual ITP, they must provide a copy of the ITP and proof of compliance with all ITP conditions to Planning and Building Services prior to issuance of a grading permit, building permit or Notice to Proceed.

- C. The applicant shall comply with the following short-term construction mitigation:
1. All sites shall be graded such that the new topography makes a smooth transition to existing adjacent topography.
 2. Dust and soil erosion control measures shall be implemented during the construction phases of all projects. These measures are intended to minimize soil erosion and fugitive dust emissions. Suggested measures include:
 - a. watering exposed soils;
 - b. covering exposed soils with straw or other materials;
 - c. adopting measures to prevent construction vehicles from tracking mud onto adjacent roadways;
 - d. covering trucks containing loose and dry soil; and
 - e. providing interim drainage measures during the construction period.
 3. In non-pavement areas, any vegetation covered or removed during grading or construction (including slope protection) should be replanted following the construction activities.
 4. Although the submitted Resources Assessment did not identify any burrowing owl, if future surveys reveal the presence of any on the project site it will be the responsibility of the project applicant to prepare a plan for relocation of the burrowing owls to a suitable site. At a minimum, the plan must include the following:
 - a. The location of the birds (and nests) proposed to be relocated;
 - b. The location of the proposed relocation site;
 - c. The number of birds involved and when during the year relocation

- is proposed to take place;
- d. The name and credentials of the biologist who would be retained by the applicant to move the birds (and nests);
- e. The method(s) proposed to catch and transport the birds (and nests) to the relocation site;
- f. A description of the preparation to be made at the relocation site where the birds (and nests) would be taken (e.g., enhancement of existing burrows, creation of artificial burrows, one-time or long-term vegetation control, etc.); and
- g. Efforts proposed to follow-up and/or monitor relocation.

IMPACT:

The impact of the proposed project on plants and animals is considered less than significant due to the inclusion of a building permit requirement to participate in the Natomas Basin HCP; due to required compliance to mitigation measures from the 1994 NNCP SEIR related to erosion control, habitat conservation plan (providing giant garter snake habitat), and protection of other special status species, including the Swainson's hawk.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

Discussion

The proposed project will result in the loss of those natural resources associated with the construction of the project. Development of the site is not anticipated to significantly accelerate the use of natural resources or deplete non-renewable resources.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
9. HAZARDS.			
<i>Would the proposal involve:</i>			
a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

Discussion

In most likelihood, there will be the storage and use of toxic or flammable materials on the subject site for use in the businesses that locate in the development area. None of the businesses will be engaged solely in the storage and distribution of large quantities of toxic or flammable material. That type of land use would not be allowed in the Employment Center Zone.

However, should toxic or flammable materials be used or stored on the site, a disclosure statement must be filed with the Fire Department which includes a list of these materials, the maximum amounts anticipated to be used, how and where these materials are stored. The Fire Department would then prepare an emergency plan which would contain this information. The potential risk associated with this proposed project is determined to be less-than-significant.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
10. NOISE.			
<i>Would the proposal result in:</i>			

a. Increases in existing noise levels?

Short-term	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Long-term	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Short-term	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Long-term	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

An Environmental Noise Analysis has been prepared for the Cambay West project by Bollard & Brennan, Inc. dated January 17, 2000, as revised on March 1, 2000, and as supplemented on January 10, 2001. This noise section discusses external noise as it impacts the operations of the project.

Identified external noise sources that may impact the site include noise from nearby Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road. Noise generated by the Sacramento International Airport does not significantly affect the project site and the Report does not analyze this. The project site is not within the 60 dB CNEL noise contours of the Sacramento International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) as shown in Exhibit 4.6-3 of the 1994 NNCP SEIR.

Noise generated by the interstate freeways is identified in the 1994 NNCP SEIR as Exhibit 4.6-4. The exhibit also indicates that buildings along Del Paso Road would be subjected to 60 or greater dB from noise generated by that major road. The NNCP Update states that "residential uses shall be allowed if located outside an area with a noise impact of greater than 60 dB CNEL." The NNCP Update EIR states that "Development exposed to surface transportation noise should be designed to be consistent with the goals of the City General Plan. Residential land uses should be developed such that there is some usable outdoor space associated with the development that provides an exterior noise level that does not exceed an Ldn of 60 dB."

The Noise Element of the City of Sacramento General Plan Update provides land use compatibility guidelines for community noise levels. These guidelines, shown in Table 4.6-3 of the 1994 NNCP SEIR, indicate a normally acceptable land use compatibility criterion of 45 dB Ldn for interior noise levels for single family and multi-family units from traffic or fixed sources and a criterion of 60 dB Ldn for exterior noise levels for single family (backyards) and multi-family (common outdoor areas).

To determine the future traffic noise levels on the project site, Bollard & Brennan, Inc. used the predicted future traffic data provided by Fehr & Peers traffic consultants. The data is based upon the North Market Interchange project analysis. The Table below shows the predicted future traffic noise levels on the project site:

<u>Predicted Future (Year 2025) Traffic Noise Levels*</u>				
Roadway	Distance to Ldn Contours (feet)			Predicted Ldn
	60 dB	65 dB	70 dB	
Interstate 5	1,344	624	290	At Nearest Building Facade 70.5 dB
Del Paso Road	309	143	67	62.8 dB
I-5 Southbound On-ramp	197	91	42	59.9 dB

*NOTE: Predicted noise levels are based upon distances from the roadway center lines.

Based upon the predicted future traffic noise levels shown in the above table, the location of future residential uses will be exposed to traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Sacramento General Plan exterior noise level standards.

Based upon the original project description which depicted residential uses at about 115' from the I-5 freeway, a 12' sound wall would have been required. However, the project has been revised to include a 300' deep Employment Center land use between the freeway (and freeway 100' landscape corridor) and the residential.

Based upon the revised site plan and the analysis, a barrier height of 6 feet, relative to the building pad elevation, is required along the east property line of the low and medium density land uses adjacent to Duckhorn Blvd. The analysis indicates, that with inclusion of this mitigation measure, the exterior traffic noise levels would comply with the City of Sacramento General Plan Noise Element criterion of 60 dB Ldn.

The Noise Analysis did not examine noise impacts of the project on the Community. However, because the project site is currently primarily vacant, there are no major on-site sources of noise. At present, there are no sensitive noise receptors (residential areas, hospitals, schools) located adjacent to the project site. During project construction, the operation of heavy equipment will result in temporary noise increases. The impact of noise from construction is anticipated to be a temporary one. Noise associated with construction activities is regulated by the Sacramento City Code, Chapter 66.

The proposed uses of the site include residential, office uses, commercial, parks, and other open spaces. After construction, the uses are not anticipated to generate any noise other than traffic generated by them. The uses, both during construction and during operations, are anticipated to generate a less-than-significant noise impact.

Mitigation Measure

ÿIU The applicant shall comply with the following mitigation measure: The barriers as shown in the Noise Analysis report submitted by applicant shall be included into the project design. The barriers can take the form of concrete block or pre-cast concrete panels, earthen berms or any combination. The barrier shall be 6 feet, relative to the building pad elevation, along the east property line of the low and medium density land uses adjacent to Duckhorn Blvd.

IMPACT

Development and operation of the various uses is anticipated to create a less-than-significant short term and long term noise impact to the North Natomas Community.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
11. PUBLIC SERVICES.			
<i>Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</i>			
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
e. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

Discussion

The proposed project would be developed in accordance with the requirements of the City's public safety codes as they relate to Fire, and Police.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alternations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

City Code Chapter 17.72 of the City of Sacramento addresses recycling and solid waste disposal requirements for new and existing developments. All non-residential and residential (multifamily of 5 or more units) developments subject to planning entitlements are required to submit a recycling program prior to the final plan check at the stage where the applicant submits the plans to the Building Department. The recycling program will be required to include a flow chart depicting the routing of recycled materials, a site plan specifying the location and design components and storage locations associated with recycling efforts, a construction plan to specify the recyclable materials being used in the construction of the proposed structures, a demolition plan specifying the proposed recycling of reusable or recyclable building materials in the demolition of any existing structures, and an educational program pertaining to recycling. This project is subject to City Code Chapter 17.72 of the City of Sacramento regarding recyclable materials. Site development was anticipated in the SGPU EIR. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact to solid waste disposal.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

13. AESTHETICS.

Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Create light or glare? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

The area surrounding the site is relatively flat and is being converted from agricultural to urban uses. Lighting details are not known at this time. However, the City Code Chapter 17.68.030.B provides assurances that off-street parking lighting, if provided, shall reflect away from residential areas and public streets.

Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance standards for lighting will ensure that the proposed development will have a less-than-significant light and glare impact upon the project vicinity. No buildings are proposed with this entitlement request. Before any building can be approved, a Special Permit must be obtained. During the review of the Special Permit request, the potential for glare from the proposed building will be analyzed.

Obstruction of a scenic view and creation of an aesthetically offensive site is not anticipated to occur. The building projects will be subject to review of the building's design as part of the review of a future conditional use permit. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a significant unanticipated aesthetic impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Disturb paleontological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Disturb archaeological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Affect historical resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

The site is located on the west side of interstate 5 in the American Basin, a large low-lying seasonally-flooded area east of the Sacramento River. The project site is identified as a Primary Impact Area in the Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (SGPU DEIR, page V-5). According to the Phase I Cultural Resources Inventory (Prepared by Ric Windmiller, Consulting Archaeologist, dated February 2000) for the project site, a study by Dames and Moore identified that Cambay West is located in an area of contributing resources for the Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape, a historic district eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The consultant (Ric Windmiller), identified no historical resources in addition to the RD-1000 on the site. According to the consultant, apart from the large scale patterns (agricultural fields) and drainage ditches identified on the property, no archaeological or historical sites are located within the project area. The fields and ditches were assessed as contributing resources to the RD-1000. However, because they lack important aspects of integrity, it is the consultant's opinion that they fail to reflect the historic associations that the district attained during its period of significance. The consultant is of the opinion that the fields and ditches are at present non-contributing resources and that no further RD-1000 specific mitigation is called for with respect to this property.

If however it is found that cultural resources could be located below the surface on other portions of the project site during construction on the site, the following mitigation measure will reduce the potential impact of the project on other cultural resources, if discovered during construction.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measures will help reduce the cultural resources impact of the project to a less-than-significant level:

- E. If subsurface archaeological or historical remains (including unusual amounts of bones, stones, or shells) are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, work shall stop immediately and a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.

Section 7070.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human burial. As prehistoric materials might include human burials, if any human remains are encountered, the County Coroner must be contacted. Compliance with the Health and Safety Code and the mitigation measure listed above will ensure a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources.

IMPACT

Development and operation of the various uses is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources in the project area.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
15. RECREATION.			
<i>Would the proposal:</i>			
a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

The project is proposed for a site that has been identified for urbanized land uses. The adopted NNCP designates 10 acres of Open Space (freeway buffer). The proposed project calls for 17.3 acres of Open Space/Park which include 5.2 acres of Neighborhood Park and 8.9 acres of Freeway Buffer.

Also, according to the 1994 North Natomas Community Plan, 80 percent of all residential units in the community plan area must be within 880 feet of some form of open space, including parks, schools, drainage canals, detention basins, and buffers. The submitted map (Subdivision Layout Exhibit) indicates that 68% single-family residential lots (143 lots) meets this requirement. 32% (67 lots) of the single-family lots do not meet the requirement. However, majority of the medium density and high density lots (Lots C, D, E & G) fall within the 880 walking contour and therefore meet the 80% minimum requirement.

Financing of park development is included in the North Natomas Financing Plan. Land acquisition of community/ neighborhood parks is paid for through Quimby Act fees and development costs of the community/ neighborhood parks are included in the Public Facilities Fee portion of the North Natomas Development Impact Fees. Land acquisition of the regional park (located off-site) is included in the Financing Plan, however, development costs of the regional park are not included in the plan. Surpluses of the Financing Plan or the City General Fund are

anticipated to be used to pay for the cost of developing the regional park. The applicant shall participate in the North Natomas Financing Plan and the Landscaping and Lighting District.

With the payment of the Quimby Act Fees, the project will have a less-than-significant impact on recreation. The development of the proposed project will not affect the quality or quantity of recreational opportunities available to the public.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact
16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.			
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Disturb paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Each of the environmental factors discussed in the preceding sections results in minor impacts, all of which can be mitigated to a less than significant environmental impact.

VI ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

VII DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section V have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Date

California Department of Fish and Game

CERTIFICATE OF FEE EXEMPTION

De Minimis Impact Finding

Project Title/Location (Include county)

P99-135 Cambay West Development/ North Natomas

The project site is located at the SW corner of Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road (APNs:225-0080-030-032; 225-0070-028) Sacramento, California . Sacramento County

Project Description:

- A. **Negative Declaration**
- B. **Mitigation Monitoring Plan**
- C. **Development Agreement** between City and Cambay Group
- D. **General Plan Amendment** on 120± vacant acres from 61.2± acres of Mixed Use, 18.8± acres of medium density residential, 30.5± acres of low density residential, and 10.2± acres of Open Space to 28± acres of Mixed Use, 11.6± acres of Medium Density Residential, 17.3± acres of Open Space, 44.4 ± acres of Low Density Residential and 19.1± acres of High Density Residential.
- E. **North Natomas Community Plan Amendment** on 120± vacant acres from 7.0± acres of EC-65, 54.2± acres of EC-40, 18.8± acres of medium density residential, and 30.5± acres of medium density residential, to 7.5 ± acres of Employment Center 65; 20.5± acres of Employment Center 40; 19.1± acres of High Density; 11.6± acres of Medium Density; 44.4± acres of Low Density; and 17.3± acres of Open Space/Park.
- F. **Rezone** of 120± acres from A-OS, to 7.5± acres of EC 65-PUD; 20.5± acres of EC 40-PUD; 22.4± acres of R-1A-PUD; 22.0 ± acres of R-1-PUD, 11.6± acres of R-2A-PUD; 19.1 ± acres of R-3-PUD, and 16± acres of A-OS-PUD and 1.3± acres of Caltrans acquisition right of way.
- G. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the boundaries of the Neighborhood #9 Planned Unit Development (PUD) from 248.67± acres to 269.4± acres by adding a 20.8± acre portion of the project area.
- H. **PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines Amendment** to amend the Gateway West PUD for Cambay West Development.
- I. **Tentative Master Parcel Map** to subdivide 13 lots totaling 120± vacant acres (Lots A-K and Villages 1 & 2)
- J. **Tentative Subdivision Map** for 101 single family lots for Village #1; 109 single family lots for Village #2; Medium Density Residential Lots E and G; High Density Residential Lots C and D; Employment Center 40 Lot B; Employment Center 65 Lot A; Open Space-Freeway Corridor Lot H; Open Space-Park Lot F; and Interstate 5 right of way (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication) Lot I.

Subdivision Modification to allow a non-standard street section (47' width) adjacent to the proposed park site.

Findings of Exemption (Attach as Necessary):

- A. An initial study was conducted by the Environmental Coordinator in order to evaluate the potential for adverse environmental impact;
- B. There is no evidence before the City to indicate that the proposed project will have any potential for adverse effect on wildlife resources.

Certification:

I hereby certify that the public agency has made the above finding and that the project will not individually or cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

By: _____
City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation

Date: _____

Section 711.4, Fish and Game Code

A copy of this document may be reviewed/obtained at the City of Sacramento, Department of Neighborhoods, Planning and Building Services, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, California, 95814.

Recording

Not

Required

-
-
-
-
-

MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

FOR

Cambay West

Type of Environmental Document:
Negative Declaration

Prepared By:
City of Sacramento Planning Division

Date:
December 23, 2000

Adopted By:
City of Sacramento, City Council

Date:

Attest:

Secretary

CITY OF SACRAMENTO MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

This Mitigation Monitoring Plan has been required and prepared by the Department of Neighborhoods, Planning and Building Services, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 264-7600, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21081.

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Name and/or File Number: Cambay West, P99-135
Applicant - Name: Pacific-Teal Development, Inc.
Address: 22672 Lambert Street, #616, Lake Forest, CA 92630
Project Location / Legal description of Property (if recorded):

SW corner of Interstate 5 and Del Paso Road

SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

The project as approved includes mitigation measures placed on air quality, noise, biological resources and cultural resources. The intent of the Plan is to prescribe and enforce a means for properly and successfully implementing the mitigation measures as identified within Attachment A of the Initial Study for this project. Unless otherwise noted, the cost of implementing the mitigation measures as prescribed by this Plan shall be funded owner/developer identified above.

The applicant is proposing a total of 210 low density single family residential units plus 45 "granny units" on 44.4 acres; 11.6 gross acres of medium density single family residential units; and 19.1 gross acres of high density multi-family units. The proposal also includes 28 acres of employment center; 17.3 acres of Open Space/Park. 1.3 acres of Caltrans acquisition right of way for freeway widening, reserved for Irrevocable Offer of Dedication, is also included as part of the proposal.

SECTION 3: PLAN COMPONENTS

A. AIR QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- A. Comply with the NNCP's requirement to prepare an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy that reduces ROG emissions by 20 percent for residential uses and 50 percent for non-residential uses.

ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE:

Department of Planning and Building, Building Division, City of Sacramento

MONITORING PROGRAM:

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a plan for compliance with the City standards related to protection of air quality and construction-related dust emissions for the development.

B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURE

- B. The applicant shall participate in the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). At the time of grading permit, the applicant shall pay the necessary fee, based on Resolutions 97-459 and 97-508, adopted by the City Council on August 7, 1997 and September 2, 1997, respectively. [As of September 12, 2000, the current fee is \$3,941 per gross acre.] On December 31, 1997, the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service executed the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

The project applicant/developer shall comply with all requirements of an adopted HCP as required in the Natomas Community Plan EIR and any additional mitigation measures identified in the Natomas Basin HCP EIR/EIS and conditions in the ITPs issued by USFWS and CDFG.

The project applicant/developer shall enter into an agreement with the City of Sacramento which will provide inter alia, that no grading permit, building permit or notice to proceed will be issued unless and until the City adopts a revised HCP and is issued by both federal and state wildlife agencies. The agreement shall also provide that the project applicant will meet all conditions of and participate to the full extent in an adopted Natomas Basin HCP and issued ITPs, or they will pursue and receive individual Incidental Take Permits (ITPs) prior to issuance of any grading permit, building permit or Notice to Proceed. If the applicant/developer is issued an individual ITP, they must provide a copy of the ITP and proof of compliance with all ITP conditions to Planning and Building Services prior to issuance of a grading permit, building permit or Notice to Proceed.

- C. The applicant shall comply with the following short-term construction mitigation:
1. All sites shall be graded such that the new topography makes a smooth

transition to existing adjacent topography.

2. Dust and soil erosion control measures shall be implemented during the construction phases of all projects. These measures are intended to minimize soil erosion and fugitive dust emissions. Suggested measures include:
 - a. watering exposed soils;
 - b. covering exposed soils with straw or other materials;
 - c. adopting measures to prevent construction vehicles from tracking mud onto adjacent roadways;
 - d. covering trucks containing loose and dry soil; and
 - e. providing interim drainage measures during the construction period.
3. In non-pavement areas, any vegetation covered or removed during grading or construction (including slope protection) should be replanted following the construction activities.
4. Although the submitted Resources Assessment did not identify any burrowing owl, if future surveys reveal the presence of any on the project site it will be the responsibility of the project applicant to prepare a plan for relocation of the burrowing owls to a suitable site. At a minimum, the plan must include the following:
 - a. The location of the birds (and nests) proposed to be relocated;
 - b. The location of the proposed relocation site;
 - c. The number of birds involved and when during the year relocation is proposed to take place;
 - d. The name and credentials of the biologist who would be retained by the applicant to move the birds (and nests);
 - e. The method(s) proposed to catch and transport the birds (and nests) to the relocation site;
 - f. A description of the preparation to be made at the relocation site where the birds (and nests) would be taken (e.g., enhancement of existing burrows, creation of artificial burrows, one-time or long-term vegetation control, etc.); and
 - g. Efforts proposed to follow-up and/or monitor relocation.

ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE:
Department of Planning and Building Services, City of Sacramento
Department of Public Works, City of Sacramento

MONITORING PROGRAM:

Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall pay the Habitat Conservation Plan fee, based on the then current per acre fee multiplied by the size of the parcel being disturbed.

C. NOISE

MITIGATION MEASURE

- D. The applicant shall comply with the following mitigation measure: The barriers as shown in the Noise Analysis report submitted by applicant shall be included into the project design. The barriers can take the form of concrete block or pre-cast concrete panels, earthen berms or any combination. The barrier shall be 6 feet, relative to the building pad elevation, along the east property line of the low and medium density land uses adjacent to Duckhorn Blvd.

ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE:

Department of Planning and Building Services, City of Sacramento

Department of Public Works, City of Sacramento

MONITORING PROGRAM:

Prior to issuance of building permit at the time it is applied for, the applicants shall submit drawings to the Building Division for review to check compliance with noise attenuation standards.

D. CULTURAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURE:

- E. If subsurface archaeological or historical remains (including unusual amounts of bones, stones, or shells) are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, work shall stop immediately and a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.

ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE:

Department of Planning and Building, City of Sacramento
Department of Public Works, City of Sacramento

MONITORING PROGRAM:

Both the Public Improvement Plans and the Building Plans shall include notes stating that if subsurface archaeological or historical remains (including unusual amounts of bones, stones, or shells) are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, all work within 50 meters of the affected area shall stop immediately. The construction plans for the project shall include the phone number of the City inspector to be contacted in the event of such a discovery. The plans shall note that a qualified archaeologists and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted in the event that any archeological materials are found.

Site inspections by the Building Division and the Department of Public Works shall inspect for any potential archeological resources during site visits. The Site Conditions Unit staff person/resident engineer in the Building Division/Public Works Department and a representative of the Planning Division shall be notified in case of an archeological discovery. The Building Division shall include this measure as a random inspection item on the Special Conditions Attachment.

If subsurface archaeological of historical remains (including unusual amount of bones, stones, or shells) are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, work within 50 meters of the affected area shall stop immediately. The developer shall contact a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less-than-significant level before construction within the affected area continues. The City department responsible for inspection and approval of the construction project shall verify the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures by referring the mitigation plans to the Planning Division for approval.

