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I. PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

1. **Project Title:** Parkview (P00-022/ P00-023)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Sacramento, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
3. **Lead Agency Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ms. Jeanne Corcoran, Associate Planner, 916/264-5328
4. **Property Owner’s Name:** Alleghany Properties, Inc.
5. **Applicant’s Name and Address:** Alleghany Properties, Inc., 2150 River Plaza Drive, Suite 150, Sacramento, CA 95833
6. **Applicant’s Contact Person and Phone Number:** Mr. Gregory Guardino, 916/648-7711
7. **Project Location:** Northwest corner of San Juan Road overpass at Interstate 5 in the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, California
8. **Property Assessor Parcel Numbers:** 225-0140-031 – 033, 040, 051; 225-0180-005, 006, 004 – 047
9. **Property Area:** Approximately 242.6 gross acres
10. **General plan designation:** 147.7 acres Low Density Residential; 19.2 acres Parks/Recreation/Open Space; 68.8 acres Mixed Use; 6.9 acres Public and Quasi/Public
11. **Community plan designation:** 76.6 acres Low Density Residential; 71.1 acres Medium Density Residential; 19.2 acres Parks/Recreation/Open Space; 68.8 acres Employment Center 40; 3.6 acres Institutional; 3.3 acres Transportation/Utilities
12. **Zoning:** 46.3 acres Agriculture – Open Space PUD; 196.3 acres Manufacturing, Research and Development PUD
13. **Description of Project:** Entitlements to develop 242.6 vacant gross acres with residential and employment center uses in the North Natomas Community Plan Area.
14. **Describe any site alterations that would result from the proposed project:** The project would construct 211 low density residential units, 501 medium density residential units, 378 high density residential units, 870,000 square feet of office space, institutional uses on 3.7 acres, 7.6 acres of parks, 12.4 acres of freeway buffer, 3.7 acres of landscape corridors, and construction of South Loop Road.
15. **Surrounding Land Use:** North – Residential and Mixed-Use PUD (Gateway West PUD); south – Residential and Mixed-Use PUD (River View PUD); east – Interstate 5; and west – Utility (Detention Basin 7a) and Residential and Mixed-Use PUD (Gateway West PUD).
16. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**
   - State Regional Water Quality Control Board
   - Department of Fish and Game
   - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
17. **The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>X Hazards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Population/Housing</td>
<td>X Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Geology/Soils</td>
<td>X Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Water</td>
<td>X Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Air Quality</td>
<td>X Aesthetics, Light and Glare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Transportation/Circulation</td>
<td>X Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Biological</td>
<td>X Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Introduction

A. Purpose of this Initial Study

The purpose of this Initial Study (IS) is to determine if approval and implementation of the Parkview project and related entitlements would have significant effects on the environment. This IS is an informational document that will provide the City of Sacramento with an analysis of the proposed project to aid in the planning and decision-making process. Based on the analysis and recommendation presented herein, the City will determine whether a Negative Declaration (ND), a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate environmental document to be prepared. It is not the purpose of this document to recommend either approval or denial of the proposed project. This IS provides the City of Sacramento with an administrative record with which to make its determination. The City will submit this document to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to appropriate agencies.

B. Environmental Analysis

This IS has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. The environmental analysis consists of the completion of the Environmental Significance Checklist provided by the City of Sacramento. This checklist shall be independently reviewed and authorized by the City of Sacramento pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063.

The questions in the Environmental Significance Checklist are intended to provide a brief environmental evaluation of the proposed project in order to identify any potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be caused by the project or that may affect the project site. If, based on this analysis, the City of Sacramento determines that there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the proposed project may cause a significant effect on the environment, the City will require the preparation of an EIR. If the City determines that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will cause a significant effect on the environment, then a Negative Declaration (ND) will be prepared. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that any feasible mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study that have been agreed to pursuant to a "Mitigation Agreement" with the City of Sacramento will be incorporated into the project. If the City determines that the mitigation measures will reduce the potentially significant effects on the environment to a level of less than significant, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) will be prepared.

The Environmental Significance Checklist is comprised of four categories of assessment. The first assessment category, "No Impact," indicates that the project will not have, or be subject to any effects on the environment. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved.

The second assessment category, "Less Than Significant Impact," indicates that the project may/will have an effect on the environment, either directly or indirectly, less than the criteria of regulatory policy. Although not required, the City may require mitigation to further limit potential impacts.

The third assessment category, "Potentially Significant Impact" indicates that there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant in context of regulatory policy.

The fourth assessment category, "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation," applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." This assessment is adequately supported if the mitigation measures are described and an explanation of how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level is provided.
III. ENVIRONMENTAL 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED 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.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact” or "potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

____________________________________  __________________________
Signature Date

____________________________________
Printed Name City of Sacramento
For
IV. Initial Study

A. Project Purpose

The purpose of the Parkview Project (P00-022/ P00-023) is to enhance the North Natomas Community by developing 242.6 gross vacant acres with residential and employment center uses consistently with the planning goals, policies, and objectives of the City of Sacramento.

B. Location

The Parkview Project is located on the northwest corner of the San Juan Road overpass at Interstate 5, in the City of Sacramento, CA. The project study area occurs on the Taylor Monument USGS Topographic Quadrangle (T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project study area consists of the following eleven Sacramento County Assessor Parcels: 225-0140-031 – 033, 225-0140-040, 225-0140-051, 225-0180-005, 225-0180-006, and 225-0180-044 – 047. The project is located within the City of Sacramento General Plan Update (SGPU) area and the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) area. A project location map is located in Appendix A (Figure 1).

C. Project Description

The Parkview Project (P00-022/ P00-023) requests a Development Agreement with the City of Sacramento to develop 242.6 gross vacant acres in the NNCP area with residential and employment center uses. As proposed, the project would result in the construction of 211 low density residential units, 501 medium density residential units, 378 high density residential units, 870,000 ft2 of office space, institutional use(s), two parks, freeway buffer, landscape corridors, and roadways and utility infrastructure. The project also includes an amendment to the NNCP designation of South Loop Road (reducing the planned road from six lanes to two plus lanes.)

The following sub-sections identify the entitlements that the project applicant, Alleghany Properties, Inc., requests.
General Plan Amendment

The proposed project seeks to change the SGPU land use designations of the 242.6 gross acre project area. Table 1 shows the acres of the existing and proposed SGPU Land Use designations, calculates the number of acres the proposed project would change, and provides the percentage of acres changed by the project. A map of the proposed General Plan Amendment is provided in Appendix A (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGPU Designation</th>
<th>Existing Net Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Net Acres</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>+20.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Recreation/Open Space</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Quasi-Public</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>+22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Plan Amendment

The proposed project seeks to change the NNCP land use designations of the 242.6 gross acre project area. Table 2 shows the acres of the existing and proposed NNCP Land Use designations, calculates the number of acres the proposed project would change, and provides the percentage of acres changed by the project. A map of the proposed Community Plan Amendment is provided in Appendix A (Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNCP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Net Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Net Acres</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>+20.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/ Open Space</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center – 40</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-68.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center – 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>+59.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/ Circulation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>+28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant also seeks an amendment to the NNCP Traffic Element to reduce the size of the planned South Loop Road from Major Roadway (six lanes) to Minor Roadway (two plus lanes).
Rezone
The proposed project seeks to rezone the 242.6 gross acre project area. Table 3 shows the acres of the existing and proposed zoning, calculates the number of acres the proposed project would change, and provides the percentage of acres changed by the project. A map of the proposed zone changes is provided in Appendix A (Figure 4).

Table 3. Proposed Zone Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Existing Gross Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Gross Acres</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Research, and Development PUD 20</td>
<td>196.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-196.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Research, and Development PUD</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture PUD</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential PUD (R-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential Alternative PUD (R-1A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>+70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential PUD (R-2A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>+9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential PUD (R-3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>+20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture – Open Space PUD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>+22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center 50 PUD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>+64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Corridor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Unit Development Amendment
The project seeks to amend the River View Planned Unit Development (PUD) to annex Parkview into the River View PUD. The existing River View PUD Area encompasses 176 acres and is planned as a mixed-use neighborhood incorporating low, medium, and high-density residential; neighborhood commercial; employment center; and parks and open space land uses. Table 4 shows the acres of NNCP Land Use designations for the existing River View PUD, Parkview, and the total acres that will be developed within the River View PUD when it is combined with the Parkview Project.

Table 4. Proposed Land Use Changes to the River View PUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>River View Gross Acres</th>
<th>Parkview Gross Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River View PUD</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>242.6</td>
<td>418.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>110.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>122.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>122.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Recreation/Open Space</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes detention basin

Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan Amendment
The project seeks to amend the River View PUD Schematic Plan to include the Parkview Schematic Plan. The proposed Schematic Plan is provided in Appendix A (Figure 5). Table 5 shows the land use summary that would be developed if the proposed Schematic Plan were approved.
Table 5. Parkview Land Use Summary from Proposed Schematic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Units Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65’x120’ (Villages 1 and 2)</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60’x110’ (Villages 3 and 4)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50’x105’ (Villages 5 and 6)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45'105' (Villages 7–11)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 17</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 31</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Parcels 8 and 27)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Buffer (A and B)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Corridors/ Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (Parcel 11)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center – 50</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional I-5 Right of Way</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential Uses:</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Parcels 8 and 27)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Buffer (A and B)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Corridors/ Open Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (Parcel 11)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center – 50</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional I-5 Right of Way</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Non-Residential Uses:</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242.6</td>
<td>242.6</td>
<td>1,120*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The River View PUD Guidelines provide a density allowance for second units by right within designated single-family areas. The standard allowance provides for 16 additional residential units within the 60-foot lot product, while allowing an additional 17 units within the 65-foot lot product.

Master Tentative Map
The project seeks approval of a Master Tentative Map to subdivide the 242.6 project site into 31 master parcels and two freeway buffer lots. The proposed Master Tentative Map is provided in Appendix A (Figure 6).

Tentative Subdivision Map
The project seeks approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide 19 of the 31 master parcels into 360 single-family lots, 251 medium density lots, two employment center lots, and eleven landscape corridor lots. The proposed Tentative Subdivision Map is provided in Appendix A (Figures 7 and 8).

D. Environmental Setting
The project is situated in the City of Sacramento within the SGPU area (City of Sacramento 1988) and within the NNCP area (City of Sacramento, 1994, amended 1996). Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. Detention Basin 7a bounds the project area to the west south of the planned South Loop Road. Residential development in the Gateway West PUD occurs west of the project site, north of Detention Basin 7a. Land north of the project site is currently vacant, but will be developed as Employment Center – 50 (EC – 50) by the Gateway West PUD. The River View PUD is planned south of San Juan Road.
V. Environmental Significance Checklist

1. Land Use/ Planning

Would the proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on land use and planning resources is based on the following factors:

- substantial changes to land uses within project area;
- incompatibility with long-term uses on adjacent properties; or
- conflict with applicable land use plans.

Impact Mechanisms

All cities and counties within California are required to adopt a general plan establishing goals and policies for their future development. In order to implement their plans, local jurisdictions adopt zoning, subdivision, grading, and other ordinances. A proposed project could conflict with planning goals, objectives, and policies, could conflict with designated land uses in the vicinity of the project, or could disrupt land use patterns by physically dividing a community.

Environmental Setting

The project is located within the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area will be bisected by the planned South Loop Road. The Detention Basin 7a borders the project area on the west, south of the planned South Loop Road. The Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north, north of the planned South Loop Road. The project area is currently designated by the SGPU for Low Density Residential, Mixed Use, Park/Recreation/Open Space, Public/Quasi-Public, and Transportation/Utilities. Table 1 (page 6 of this Initial Study) lists the number of acres attributed for each SGPU designation and Figure 2 (Appendix A) shows the existing SGPU land use designations on a project map. The NNCP designates the project area for Employment Center – 40 (EC – 40), Institutional, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Parks/Recreation/Open Space, and Transportation/Utilities. Table 2 (on page 6 of this Initial Study) lists the number of acres attributed for each NNCP designation and Figure 3 (Appendix A) shows the existing NNCP land use designations on a project map. The project study area is currently zoned for Agriculture – Open Space PUD and Manufacturing, Research and Development PUD. Table 3 (on page 7 of this Initial Study) lists the number of acres attributed for each zone and Figure 4 (Appendix A) shows the existing zoning on a project map.
The Parkview Project (P00-022/ P00-023) seeks a Development Agreement with the City of Sacramento to
develop 242.6 acres in the North Natomas Community. As proposed, the project would result in the
construction of 211 single family residential units, 501 medium density residential units, 378 high density
residential units, 870,000 ft² of office space, institutional use(s), two parks, freeway buffer, landscape
corridors, and roadways and utility infrastructure. The project also includes an amendment to the NNCP
designation of South Loop Road (reducing the road from six lanes to two plus lanes.)

The project applicant requests approval of the following entitlements:

- General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of 24.9 acres;
- Community Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of 93.4 acres;
- Community Plan Amendment to reduce the capacity of the planned South Loop Road from six lanes
to two plus lanes;
- Zone change of 242.6 acres;
- Planned Unit Development Amendment to include Parkview with the existing River View PUD;
- Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan Amendment to include Parkview with the existing River
View PUD Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan;
- Master Tentative Map to subdivide 242.6 acres into 31 master parcels; and
- A Tentative Subdivision Map subdividing 19 master parcels into 360 single-family lots, 251 medium
density lots, two employment center lots, and eleven landscape corridor lots.

Regulatory Setting

The project is located within the boundaries of the SGPU area and NNCP area.

City of Sacramento General Plan

SGPU states that the NNCP area accounts for 38.9% of vacant acreage in the SGPU area (SGPU, D-37).
According to the SGPU Land Use Map (12 December 2000), Low Density Residential, Mixed Use,
Park/Recreation/Open Space, Public/Quasi-Public, and Transportation/Utilities would be developed on the
project site. Low Density Residential allows 4 – 15 dwelling units per net acre (SGPU, B-14). SGPU asserts
that wherever development of vacant land occurs, there is a potential for conflict between the new and the
existing uses. Of primary concern are conflicts between agriculture and urbanization and residential and
nonresidential. In the matter of residential-nonresidential conflicts, land use conflicts would constitute a
significant adverse impact (SGPU, D-43). On page D-41, SGPU states that the conversion of vacant and rural
lands to urban uses would bring about a significant change in the character of Sacramento. The conversion of
vacant and rural lands and the resulting potential conflicts could be reduced to a less than significant level by
the implementation of the following mitigation measures (SGPU, D-53):

- retaining designated open space, parks and recreational areas;
- enforcing setback requirements;
- requiring landscaping and beautification of industrial areas; and
- buffering transitional uses.

The SGPU set Overall Urban Growth Policies (SGPU, C-37) and Goals and Policies for the following
elements: Residential Land Use and Housing, Commerce and Industry Land Use, Circulation, Conservation
and Open Space, Public Facilities and Services, and Health and Safety (SGPU, C38 – C66). Table 7
(beginning on page 13 of this Initial Study) in the Impact Assessment section provides an assessment of the
consistency of the proposed land use designation changes with the Overall Urban Growth Policies and the
applicable Goals and Policies of the Residential Land Use and Housing and the Commerce and Industry Land
Use elements of the SGPU. Subsequent sections of this Initial Study provide an evaluation of the proposed
project with the Overall Goals and Strategies related by element (e.g., Section 6 Transportation/ Circulation
evaluates the project’s consistency with the Overall Goals and Strategies of the SGPU Circulation Element).
North Natomas Community Plan
The NNCP envisions a new urban form for North Natomas that includes a well integrated mixture of residential, employment, commercial, and civic uses, interdependent on quality transit service and a radial network of connections linking activity centers with streets, transit routes, and linear parkways with pedestrian and bike trails. The plan nurtures neighborhood bonds by providing community services and facilities and encouraging the formation of neighborhood associations (NNCP, 2).

The Land Use program for the NNCP designates the general location, size, relationship, and intensity of land uses. The NNCP is designed to encourage a balance of jobs and housing opportunities in the community. It establishes a minimum jobs/housing ratio of 58% for the community and 66% for the City. Projects that propose to vary from the land use plan must improve the overall jobs/housing balance in the community, or otherwise mitigate any impact to the target ratio (NNCP, 6). The impact on the jobs/housing ratio of any proposed rezone should be analyzed and the community-wide jobs/housing ratio maintained prior to the approval of any rezone (NNCP, 15). The City of Sacramento considers projects that achieve the target densities for planned development to be consistent with the NNCP jobs/housing ratio (personal communication, J. Corcoran, City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department). Table 6 shows the target density for development by land use designation. Residential target densities are found on page 6 of the NNCP and Employment Center employees per net acre are found on page 20 of the NNCP.

Table 6. Target Density for Development Within the NNCP Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Allowed Density</th>
<th>Target Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>3 to 10 units per acre</td>
<td>7 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>7 to 21 units per acre</td>
<td>12 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>11 — 29 Units per acre</td>
<td>22 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Estates</td>
<td>1 unit per acre</td>
<td>1 unit per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Minimum Employees Per Net Acre</th>
<th>Average Employees Per Net Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center — 80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NNCP set Guiding Policies for Residential development (NNCP, 13) and Employment Centers development (NNCP, 19) in North Natomas. Table 8 (beginning on page 18 of this Initial Study) in the Impact Assessment section provides an assessment of the consistency of the proposed project with the Guiding Policies of the NNCP. Subsequent sections of this Initial Study provide an evaluation of the proposed project with the Guiding Policies related by element (e.g., Section 6 Transportation/ Circulation evaluates the project’s consistency with theGuiding Policies of the NNCP Circulation Element).

Sacramento City Code – Zoning Ordinance
SCC Title 17.20 Zoning Districts: Establishes zones within the City of Sacramento that define minimum and maximum lot sizes and allowed development densities.

R-1—Standard Single-Family Zone. This is a low density residential zone composed of single-family detached residences on lots a minimum of 52 feet by 100 feet in size. A duplex or halfplex is allowed on a corner lot subject to compliance with specific restrictions. This zone may also include recreational, religious and educational facilities as the basic elements of a balanced neighborhood. Such areas should be clearly defined and without encroachment by uses not performing a neighborhood function. Minimum lot dimensions are 52 feet by 100 feet interior, 62 feet by 100 feet corner. Approximate density for the R-1 zone is six to eight dwelling units per acre.

R-1A—Single-Family Alternative Zone. This is a low to medium density residential zone intended to permit the establishment of single-family, individually owned, attached or detached residences where lot sizes, height, area and/or setback requirements vary from standard single-family. This zone is intended to accommodate
alternative single-family designs which are determined to be compatible with standard single-family areas and which might include single-family attached or detached units, townhouses, cluster housing, condominiums, cooperatives or other similar projects. Approximate density for the R-1A zone is 10 dwelling units per acre. Maximum density in this zone is 15 dwelling units per net acre.

R-2B--Multi-Family Zone. This is a multi-family residential zone. This zone offers broader density flexibility as a transition from the garden apartment setting to a more traditional apartment setting. Units can be individually owned through compliance with the condominium regulations in Chapter 17.192 of this title. Minimum land area per unit is 2,000 square feet. Maximum density for the R-2B zone is 21 dwelling units per acre.

AOS--Agriculture-Open Space Zone. This is an exclusive agricultural zone designed for the long term preservation of agricultural and open space land. This zone is designated to prevent the premature development of land in this category to urban uses. Pursuant to SCC Title 17.48.010, the purpose of these open space regulations is: to protect the public health, safety and welfare; contain and structure urban development; protect and preserve undeveloped land as a limited and valuable resource; and to provide for managed resource production and preservation, outdoor recreation, public health and safety, and visual amenity.

EC--Employment Center Zone. This zone is a flexible zone for primarily employment generating uses in a pedestrian friendly setting with ample private and/or public open space. The EC zone also provides the opportunity for a variety and mix of supporting uses, including support retail, residential, and light industrial. The EC zone has several categories of permitted intensity ranging from 30 employees per net acre (EC30) to 80 employees per net acre (EC80). The designation of intensity will be determined by proximity to planned transit service, freeway/roadway access, maintaining or improving housing opportunities, and maintaining or improving the environmental qualities within the EC zone area.

TC--Transportation Corridor Zone. This zone is intended to regulate land uses within, above, and below public transportation corridors to insure that the development thereof is consistent with the general plan, and to provide uniform standards for the development of ground rights and/or air rights within such corridor.

SCC Title 17.56 Employment Center Zone: Provides the allowable land uses within the EC PUD and defines the range of development. Within each PUD, acreage shall be designated for primary uses and to nonprimary uses. Within each PUD, a minimum of 45% and a maximum of 95% of PUD net acreage shall be designated for, and devoted to, primary uses. Within each PUD, a maximum of 10% of the PUD net acreage shall be designated for and devoted to support retail uses. EC PUDs that are two acres or greater in size will be required to provide support retail/services uses within a primary use structure or within a stand-alone building. Within each PUD, a maximum of 25% of the PUD net acreage shall be designated for and devoted to residential uses. Within each PUD, a maximum of 20% of the PUD net acreage shall be designated for and devoted to light industrial/MRD uses.

SCC Title 17.180 Planned Unit Developments (PUDS) Regulations and Maps: The purpose of this chapter is to provide for greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of zoning regulations. It is the intent of this chapter to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing or other land uses through creative and imaginative planning.

A PUD designation constitutes an overlay zone. However, approval of a PUD designation or a schematic plan does not establish an underlying zone or enlarge the uses provided by a zoning classification, or establish the rights for a special permit.

An amendment to the PUD schematic plan and/or guidelines may be initiated by the city council, the planning commission, or by the owner of any parcel of property within the planned unit development. The planning commission may grant the amendment of a PUD schematic plan and/or guidelines provided that each of the following conditions are met:

a. The proposed amendments to the PUD schematic plan and/or guidelines do not alter the height or setback requirements by more than five feet or 10%, whichever is greater, than that set forth in the PUD guidelines;
b. The proposed amendments to the PUD schematic plan and/or guidelines do not change the types or
intensity of land uses.

Except as otherwise provided in the special permit or in the resolution to designate the PUD, no building permit shall be issued for any building or structure within the boundaries of a PUD until the plans submitted for the building permit have been reviewed by the planning director to determine that said plans conform to a valid special permit issued for a PUD under this chapter. No building or structure unit within a PUD may be occupied until an inspection of the project has been made by the planning director to see that all conditions of the special permit have been complied with.

SCC Title 17.212 Special Permits: A special permit may be granted at the discretion of the zoning administrator, planning commission or city council and is not the automatic right of any applicant. In considering an application for a special permit, the following guidelines shall be observed:
A. Sound Principles of Land Use. A special permit shall be granted upon sound principles of land use.
B. Not Injurious. A special permit shall not be granted if it will be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or if it results in the creation of a nuisance.
C. Must Relate to a Plan. A special permit use must comply with the objectives of the general or specific plan for the area in which it is to be located.

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal conflict with general plan designation or zoning?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impacts: The project proposes to change 24.9 acres (10%) of the SGPU land use designation; 93.4 acres (38%) of the NNCP land use designation; and rezone 242.6 acres of the project area. Table 7 provides an assessment of the consistency of the proposed land use designation changes with the Overall Urban Growth Policies and the applicable Goals and Policies of the Residential Land Use and Housing and the Commerce and Industry Land Use elements of the SGPU.

Table 7. Project Consistency with the Applicable SGPU Land Use Goals and Policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGPU Element</th>
<th>Applicable SGPU Goals and Policies</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Urban Growth Policy</td>
<td>Policy 1 – Quality of Life: It is the policy of the City to enhance and maintain the quality of life by adhering to high standards for project and plan evaluation as they relate to the following characteristics that help to define the quality of life in the City: The protection and preservation of the urban and natural environment, A valuable asset for each community is the open space and parks that are provided for recreational purposes.</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project is subject to the North Natomas Development Guidelines (NNDG). The NNDG are intended to implement the planning principles identified in the NNCP. Adherence to NNDG ensures that the vision of a holistic community is developed. The NNDG protects and preserves the urban character of North Natomas and defines standards for open space. The proposed project also seeks an amendment to the existing River View PUD to include the proposed project. The River View PUD Development Guidelines, used in conjunction with the SCC Zoning Ordinance, NNCP, and NNDG, provide further direction on the standards that will ensure that the project preserves the quality of development within the City of Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 2 – Population and Housing Growth: It is the policy of the City to ensure that adequate quality housing opportunities are provided for all income households and that projected housing needs are accommodated.</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project will designate 132.4 net acres for Low Density Residential, 20.1 net acres for Medium Density Residential, and 59.2 net acres for Mixed Use. A total of approximately 1,090 housing opportunities will be built on the project site. An approximate total of 211 low-density residential units (19%), 501 medium density residential units (46%) and 378 high density residential units (35%) are proposed for the project site. Under the NNCP 25% of the Mixed Use (ECs – 50) could be developed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 3 — Economic Development and Employment Opportunities: It is the policy of the City to actively promote the continued vitality and diversification of the local economy, and to expand employment opportunities for City residents.

Policy 4 — New Growth Areas: It is the policy of the City to approve development in the City's new growth areas that promotes efficient growth patterns and public service extensions, and is compatible with adjacent developments.

Policy 6 — General Plan Land Use Amendments: It is the policy of the City in considering GP land use map amendments to evaluate the impact of such amendments upon the GP and CP goals and policies.

Policy 8 — Transportation: It is the policy of the City to promote an efficient, safe, and balanced transportation system.

Policy 9 — Local and Regional Government: It is the policy of the City to cooperate with the region's various public jurisdictions on matters of mutual interest including social, economic, and environmental issues; land use policies; and private development project review.

Consistent. The project proposes to designate 59.2 net acres for Mixed Use with a zone change to EC – 50. The project would develop approximately 870,000 ft² of office space. Pursuant to the SCC Zoning 17.20.10, the 59.2 net acres could yield up to 2,960 employees. This would be a positive impact for the economy of the City of Sacramento and potentially an important base for the local economy of the NNCP area.

Consistent. The NNCP area was identified in the SGPU as the major growth area for new housing and employment opportunities. At full build out, the community is projected to account for 35% of the new housing and 30% of new jobs in the City (NNCP-2). The proposed project is compatible with adjacent developments and represents an efficient growth pattern with its connection with the River View PUD.

Consistent. This document evaluates the proposed project's consistency with the SGPU and NNCP. No substantial inconsistencies have been identified that would be considered a significant conflict.

Consistent. The proposed project would not impede City plans for the development of infrastructure or improvements of existing infrastructure. The proposed project is consistent with the NNCP, which places importance on the balance of vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle access to community services.

Consistent. The proposed project occurs within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The project is therefore regulated for air quality impacts by this agency.

The project occurs within the sphere of influence of Sacramento County and Sacramento County Council of Governments. These agencies have the opportunity to evaluate the project's consistency with planning goals of Sacramento County.

The proposed project will receive public services from such agencies as Regional Transit Authority, the Sacramento Fire Department, the Sacramento Police and Sacramento Sheriff's departments, and Sacramento Municipal Utilities District. The agencies will have the opportunity to evaluate the project in terms of design and service capabilities.

The project falls within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
Policy 10 – Open Space and Natural Resources: It is the policy of the City to conserve and protect natural resources and planned open space areas, and to phase the conversion of agricultural lands to planned urban uses.

Consistent. The proposed project occurs within the Natomas Basin, which is recognized as habitat for several state and federal listed threatened and endangered species including giant garter snake, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and Swainson’s hawk. The City of Sacramento prepared the “Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan” in 1997. The plan was approved by DFG and USFWS and USFWS, DFG, and the City signed an "Implementation Agreement for the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan". DFG and USFWS issued an Incidental Take Permit to the City of Sacramento. The Federal Court later invalidated the Incidental Take Permit. An agreement was reached in March 2001 to settle state and federal claims against the Habitat Conservation Plan. The City is currently preparing a new Habitat Conservation Plan in order to obtain a valid Incidental Take Permit. The proposed project would be eligible for inclusion with the Permit should it be obtained. The Development Agreement between the project applicant and the City of Sacramento would stipulate inclusion. If it the Permit is not obtained, pursuant to Policy 9 above, the applicant would be required to obtain an Incidental Take Permit prior to construction.

Policy 11 – Public Services: It is the policy of the City to provide a full range of adequate municipal services in order to meet resident and worker needs and to assure a healthy, orderly development and maintenance of its communities. It is important that these services are coordinated with the expected growth of the City.

Consistent. Public services, including potable water, water for fire fighting, fire protection services, law enforcement services, sewer service, storm drain service, and educational services are adequate to accommodate the proposed project. The Development Agreement will stipulate Development Fees for the project’s proportional use. These fees are based on results of the North Natomas Nexus Study Update (August 1999) and enforced by the North Natomas Financing Plan.

Residential Land Use and Housing Element

Overall Goals

Goal A: Maintain and improve the quality and character of residential neighborhoods in the City.

Goal B: Provide affordable housing for all income groups.

Goal C: Meet fair share regional housing needs for all economic segments within the City.

Residential Strategy

Goal A: Improve the quality of residential neighborhoods

Consistent. Adherence to NNDG ensures that the vision of a holistic community is developed. The NNDG protects and preserves the character of North Natomas.

Consistent. The mix of planned housing types ensures that a variety of new housing will be available for a range of social and income levels.

Consistent. The mix of planned housing types ensures that a variety of new housing will be available for a range of social and income levels.

Consistent. Adherence to NNDG ensures that
Citywide by protecting, preserving, and enhancing their character.

Policy 3: Utilize established Multiple-Family Design Guidelines in reviewing multiple-family development on a Citywide basis.

Policy 6: Prohibit the intrusion of incompatible uses into residential neighborhoods through adequate buffers, screening, and zoning practices.

Policy 7: Protect and preserve architectural, cultural, and historic structures through the existing preservation program.

Goal D: Maintain orderly residential growth in areas where urban services are readily available or can be provided in an efficient, cost-effective manner.

Policy 2: Approve residential development only where City services are provided in a manner that meets the needs of the proposed development.

Goal E: Provide appropriate residential opportunities to meet the City’s required fair share of the region’s housing needs.

Policy 1: Provide housing opportunities in newly developing communities and in large mixed-use developments in an effort to reduce travel time to and from employment centers.

Policy 2: Use mixed-use housing and employment centers to help meet housing needs and reduce traffic in new development within the City.

Policy 3: Establish guidelines for mixed-use projects and allow these uses in urbanized areas of the City where intensive development is planned.

Consistent. Adherence to NNDG ensures that the vision of a holistic community is built. The NNDG protects and preserves the character of North Natomas.

Consistent. The proposed project is compatible with adjacent developments and represents an efficient growth pattern with its connection with the River View PUD.

Consistent. The Witter Ranch Historic Farm occurs west of the project study area. The project will not affect the historic property. A 10-acre detention basin serves as an open space buffer between the proposed Low Density Residential designation and the historic property.

Consistent. Public services are adequate to accommodate the proposed project. The Development Agreement will stipulate Development Fees for the project’s proportional use.

Consistent. Public services are adequate to accommodate the proposed project. The Development Agreement will stipulate Development Fees for the project’s proportional use.

Consistent. The mix of planned housing types ensures that a variety of new housing will be available for a range of social and income levels.

Consistent. The proposed project is a large mixed-use development. The project includes 59.2 net acres of Mixed Use (EC - 50) land use designation. This designation is capable supporting up to 2,960 employees.

Consistent. The proposed project is a large mixed-use development. The project would designate 132.4 net acres for Low Density Residential, 20.1 net acres for Medium Density Residential. A total of approximately 1,123 housing opportunities could be developed on the project site.

Consistent. The proposed project seeks an amendment to the existing River View PUD to include the proposed project. The River View PUD Development Guidelines, used in conjunction with the SCC Zoning Ordinance, NNCP, and NNDG, provide further direction on the standards that will ensure that the project preserves the quality of development within the City of Sacramento.

Consistent. The proposed project will not affect the role of downtown. Planned light rail lines in the NNCP area will provide residents of North Natomas a way to work in the downtown that will lessen impacts on traffic and air quality. The light rail lines will also enable
Goal C: Promote new employment opportunities, particularly for the underemployed and economically disadvantaged.

Goal D: Promote economic vitality and diversification of the local economy.

Regional Commercial and Office Areas

Goal B: Promote development of mixed-use regional commercial and office projects.

Policy I: Strongly encourage new regional commercial and office centers to incorporate accessory uses.

Neighborhood/Community Commercial and Office Areas

Goal A: Ensure that all areas of the City are adequately served by neighborhood/community shopping districts.

Goal B: Promote mixed-use development of neighborhood/community commercial districts through new construction and revitalization.

Table 8 provides an assessment of the consistency of the proposed land use designation changes with the Guiding Policies of the NNCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNCP Element</th>
<th>NNCP Policies</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Guiding Policies</td>
<td>A. Each neighborhood shall provide a variety of housing densities, types, and prices to enhance a neighborhood identity, serve the wide array of residents, and avoid monotony.</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project achieves a variety of densities – ranging from 5.3 dwelling units per acre to 21 dwelling units per acre. Opportunity exists for the development of 14.8 net acres of apartment complexes within the area designated for EC – 50 (25% of total Employment Center acreage). The River View PUD Development Guidelines stipulate that the developer shall be required to provide three different models each with three different elevations for the 50 – 100 homes developed. This achieves the NNCP standard of maximum 85 % of any dominant housing type and 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Each neighborhood shall have an elementary school as its focal point located near the center of the area. Partially Consistent. The proposed project occurs in Neighborhood 3. The project as proposed does not include construction of an elementary school. An elementary school is planned within the Gateway West PUD, which occurs in Neighborhood 2. However, the Gateway West PUD is adjacent to the proposed project site.

C. Each dwelling should have convenient access to a commercial center. Convenient access should be provided along a local connection, such as a local street or pedestrian/bike path, or residential collector, rather than on an arterial street. Partially Consistent. Although the project does not propose to designate Commercial within the project area, the Employment Center will be required to develop accessory uses, which will provide services to employees and residents. The project seeks amendment into the River View PUD. The existing River View PUD includes Commercial. With the project’s inclusion in the River View PUD, residents will be conveniently located near a neighborhood commercial use.

D. At least 80% of the dwelling units shall be within 880 feet of open space. Open space includes accessible public and private parks and parkways, drainage corridors, agricultural buffers, golf course, lakes, and other open space opportunities. Consistent. As shown in Figure 9 in Appendix A, “880-foot Walking Map,” 91% of the residential lots are within the 880 feet of open space opportunities.

E. The formation of neighborhood associations should be encouraged to resolve common problems and undertake neighborhood projects based on utilization of available neighborhood resources. Partially Consistent. The proposed project does not involve the formation of neighborhood associations nor does it impede the formation of such associations.

F. Maintain a minimum jobs/housing ratio of 58% for the NNCP area and 66% for the city portion of the NNCP area. Partially Consistent. The City of Sacramento considers projects that achieve the target densities for planned development to be consistent with the NNCP jobs/housing ratio. The project is nearly consistent with the target densities established in the NNCP. Low Density would develop at net density of 6 dwelling units per net acre (the target is 7 dwelling units per net acre). Medium Density would develop at 11.3 dwelling units per net acre (the target is 12 dwelling units per net acre).

Employment Center Guiding Policies

A. Designate Employment Centers along the light rail corridor, along both sides of Interstate 5, and elsewhere in the community in order to provide flexible, mixed-use employment centers that serve the needs of major employers and employees. Consistent. The proposed project would designate 59.2 net acres of EC — 50 within an area already designated EC — 40. The area is along the west side of Interstate 5. Proposed RT Bus lines will provide connection to the proposed light rail corridor.

B. Create mixed-use Employment Centers by allowing major employers and permitting support uses such as retail, residential, and light industrial uses in the EC designation. Consistent. Adherence to NNDG ensures that commercial and office uses incorporate accessory uses. The NNDG provides specific ratios for planning accessory uses for commercial and office projects. The Employment Center PUD designation in the NNCP allows 0 – 10% net acres of Support Retail Goods and Services development.

C. Locate the highest intensity EC uses along the light rail corridor to encourage interdependence between the transit service and land uses. Partially Consistent. The proposed project would designate 59.2 net acres of EC — 50 within an area already designated EC — 40. The
D. Encourage further intensification of EC uses within 1/8 mile of the light rail stations once funding the construction of the light rail extension is assured.

E. Decrease the need for off-site auto trips during the day by requiring support retail within each EC PUD.

F. Maintain or improve the 1986 jobs/housing ratio of 66% in the city portion of the NNCP area.

G. Improve the jobs/housing link by permitting residential uses in close proximity to the major employers.

The proposed project is mostly consistent with SCC Title 17, Zoning. The Parkview Project is consistent with SCC Title 17 in that:

- The proposed project conforms to the density requirements of SCC Title 17.20.
- The proposed amendments to the River View PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines do not alter the height or setback requirements by more than five feet or 10%.
- The proposed project does not alter densities of development within the River PUD.
- The existing River View PUD Development Guidelines require developers within the PUD to obtain a Special Permit from the City of Sacramento prior to construction. The proposed project follows sound principles of land use; is not injurious; and is consistent with the SGPU and NNCP.

The proposed amendments to the River View PUD Schematic Plan and Guidelines are not consistent with SCC Title 17 in that the project would change the types of land uses within the existing PUD. The proposed project would include the addition of 4.2 acres of Institutional land use to the existing River View PUD. This would occur within an area to be zoned EC – 50 adjacent to a proposed park use. The existing PUD contains 50.3 acres of EC zone. The Parkview Project would add 60.4 acres of EC – 50 to the existing Riverview PUD for a total of 110.7 acres of EC – 50. The addition of the 4.2 acres of Institutional land use would result in a benefit to the River View PUD because the Institutional land use would provide a focal point to the EC – 50, as well as to the proposed park.

**Level of Significance:** Because the Parkview Project is consistent with the SGPU, mostly consistent with the NNCP, and nearly consistent with the SCC Zoning Ordinance, the proposed land use designation changes, zone changes, and amendment of the River View PUD to include the Parkview Project, are considered less than significant.
Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the proposal conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impacts: The proposed project would develop 242.6 gross vacant and ongoing agricultural acres within the Natomas Basin. The Natomas Basin is recognized as habitat for several state and federal listed threatened and endangered species including giant garter snake, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and Swainson's hawk. The take of individual state or federal species and/or the elimination of habitat for state and federal species would be considered a significant impact under CEQA. The project is within the jurisdiction of DFG and USFWS. These resource agencies regulate the project for impacts on special-status plants and wildlife. It is the policy of the City of Sacramento to cooperate with the region’s various public jurisdictions on matters of mutual interest including environmental issues (SGPU, C-37). The City of Sacramento will therefore not approve projects that would violate the regulatory authority of DFG and USFWS.

Pursuant to Policy 9 (Local and Regional Government) and Policy 10 (Open Space and Natural Resources Conservation) on page C-37 of the SGPU, the City of Sacramento prepared the “Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan” in 1997. The plan was approved by DFG and USFWS. The City, USFWS, and DFG signed an “Implementation Agreement for the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan”. DFG and USFWS issued an Incidental Take Permit to the City of Sacramento. The Federal Court later invalidated the Incidental Take Permit. An agreement was reached in March 2001 to settle state and federal claims against the Habitat Conservation Plan. The City is currently preparing a new Habitat Conservation Plan in order to obtain a valid Incidental Take Permit. The proposed project would be eligible for inclusion with the Permit should it be obtained. The Development Agreement between the project applicant and the City of Sacramento would stipulate the project’s inclusion. If it the Permit were not obtained, pursuant to Policy 9 above, the applicant would be required to obtain an Incidental Take Permit prior to construction.

Level of Significance: The proposed project is a discretionary action by the City of Sacramento. The City has committed to preserve the imminent loss of habitat in the Natomas Basin by conditioning projects to mitigate for the loss of habitat. Therefore, the project will conform to the City of Sacramento’s policies as well as to CEQA, the California Endangered Species Act, and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Potential impacts of the proposed project related to environmental plans or policies are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Would the proposal be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?

Answer: No. Adjacent land uses are either developed as mixed-use residential communities or are designated for development as mixed-use residential communities.

d) Would the proposal affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impacts: The proposed project would develop 242.6 acres of land identified as Prime Agricultural Soils — Irrigated in 1984 by the SGPU (SGPU, T-17). The determination is based on soil survey data and soil maps for the Soil Survey of Sacramento County, CA prepared by the U.S. Conservation Service in 1986 (now called Natural Resource Conservation Service – NRCS) and data obtained from the California Department of Water Resources.

The SGPU identified the conversion of Prime Agricultural Land in the North Natomas area as a significant impact, for which no mitigation was feasible. No part of the project area was designated for Agricultural
use. Therefore, by adopting the General Plan, the City of Sacramento has planned for the significant impact on a program level.

**Level of Significance:** The final conversion of the Prime Agricultural Land is a significant unavoidable impact on a program level and a less than significant impact on a project level.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

e) **Would the proposal disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?**

**Answer:** No.
2. Population/Housing

Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? 

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure?)

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on population housing is based on questions 2. a-c in the environmental checklist.

Impact Mechanisms

Proposed projects that would introduce substantial population growth or make it possible for such growth to occur would significantly affect population and housing. Projects that would displace substantial housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing could also have a significant impact.

Environmental Setting

The project is located within the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area will be bisected by the planned South Loop Road. Detention Basin 7a borders the project area on the west, south of the planned South Loop Road. The Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north, north of the planned South Loop Road. The project area is currently designated by the SGPU for Low Density Residential, Mixed Use, Park/Recreation/Open Space, Public/Quasi-Public, and Transportation/Utilities. The NNCP designates the project area for EC – 40, Institutional, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Parks/Recreation/Open Space, and Transportation/Circulation. The project study area is currently zoned for Agriculture – Open Space PUD and Manufacturing, Research and Development PUD.

The SGPU projects the population of North Natomas to increase to 69,899 by 2016. North Natomas is projected to contain 13.3% of the SGPU’s build out population and capture 31.6% of the City’s growth between 1986 and 2016 (SGPU, E-25). The NNCP projects a population of 66,495 for the year 2016 (NNCP, 14). Table 9 shows a population estimate for the project site under its existing NNCP land use designations and Table 10 shows a population estimate for the project site under the proposed NNCP land use designations.

Table 9. Project Site Population Estimate Based on Existing NNCP Land Use Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNCP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Net Acres</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>People/DU</th>
<th>Population*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential (7 DU/acre)</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (12 DU/acre)</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center (25% at 22 DU/acre)**</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164.9</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- = Not applicable
* Rounded to the nearest integer
** The Employment Center PUD allows development of 25% of the net acreage to be developed as high-density apartment housing. The site is currently designated for 68.8 acres of EC – 40.
Table 10. Project Site Population Estimate Based on Proposed NNCP Land Use Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNCP Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Net Acres</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>People/DU</th>
<th>Population*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center (25% at 22 DU/acre)**</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- = Not applicable
* Rounded to the nearest integer
** The Employment Center PUD allows development of 25% of the net acreage to be developed as high-density apartment housing. The project proposes to designate 55.3 acres for EC - 50.

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: As it was designated in the NNCP, the project study area could result in a population increase of 3,572 people. The project, as proposed, could result in a population increase of 3,952. The proposed project would result in a population increase of 380 (11%) more people than what was planned for by the City of Sacramento in the NNCP.

Impact Significance: The proposed project is mostly consistent with the NNCP. Therefore, this potential impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the proposal induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure?)

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impacts: The proposed project will involve the development of 242.6 gross vacant acres. The development could lead to a population increase of 3,952 people. The population increase is only 380 (11%) more people than the development planned in the NNCP. Furthermore, 216.5 acres of the project site was designated for residential and mixed-use development under the SGPU.

Level of Significance: The proposed project is consistent with the SGPU and NNCP. Therefore, the substantial growth on the project site is considered a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Would the proposal displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Answer: No. The proposed project will not displace existing housing and will not deter the construction other planned developments.
3. Geology/ Soils

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fault rupture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) A geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on geology and soils is based on questions 3 a-g in the environmental checklist.

Impact Mechanisms

Geology, seismicity, and soil impact mechanisms include constructing structures not capable of withstanding seismic events and/or accelerated erosion caused by soil disturbance.

Environmental Setting

The proposed is located on the northwest corner of the San Juan Road overpass at Interstate 5, in the City of Sacramento, CA. The project study area occurs on the Taylor Monument USGS Topographic Quadrangle (T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project is located within the SGPU area and the NNCP area. Elevation of the project study area ranges from 3 feet above sea level to 15 feet above sea level. Terrain in the project study area exhibits very little relief. The project site drains from the northeast to the southwest.

Raney Geotechnical (Raney) conducted soil investigations and prepared a Soil Investigation Parkview Subdivision Report (Raney, 2000a) and a Preliminary Soil Investigation Natomas Crossing Freeway Commercial Properties Report (Raney, 2000b). The investigations included drilling 27 test borings to a maximum depth of 20 feet below site grade. The samples were then analyzed in the laboratory to determine earthwork, pavement design sections for public roads, parking and driveway pavements, foundation, and floor support recommendations. Copies of these reports are available at the City of Sacramento.

Geology

Surface sediments within the project study area derive from the Victor Formation. The Victor Formation is a complex mixture of consolidated, ancient river-borne sediments of all textures. Weathering has caused a hardpan layer to develop near the surface, allowing moderate-to-low rate of rainwater infiltration (SGPU, T-1).
Seismic Hazards
No known faults or Alquist-Priolo special studies zones occur in or adjacent to the City of Sacramento, therefore no known hazard of surface rupture exists (SGPU, T-3).

However, thirteen major faults occur within a 62 mi radius of the City of Sacramento. SGPU reports that the City of Sacramento occurs in the California Department of Mines and Geology’s (CDMG) “low” and “moderate” earthquake severity zones corresponding to the probable maximum intensity of VII-VII (Modified Mercalli Scale). The Mercalli Scale quantifies the severity of an earthquake on a scale from I (Not felt) to XII (Damage total). An earthquake rated VI = felt by all; many are frightened and run out doors (damage slight); VII = everybody runs out doors (damage negligible in buildings of good design); and VIII = damage slight in specially designed buildings (considerable damage in ordinary substantial buildings). The highest earthquake severity experienced in Sacramento in recorded history is VI (SGPU, T-6 – T-11).

Liquefaction is the transformation of a granular material from a solid state to a liquid state as a consequence of increased pore-water pressures. Liquefaction can occur in low-lying areas that are comprised of unconsolidated, saturated, clay-free sands and silts. Saturated, sandy soils in loose-to-medium dense condition have been observed to liquefy during earthquakes ranging from an intensity of 5.5 – 8.5 on the Richter Scale. The SGPU reports that the City of Sacramento occurs within the liquefaction opportunity zone of maximum credible earthquakes. Only through geologic mapping, based on deep subsoil borings, can liquefaction potential can be estimated.

Soils
Based on Natural Resource Conservation Service soil maps for the Soil Survey of Sacramento County, CA (NRCS April 1993), the project study area contains the soils listed and described below. The soils ”115-Clear Lake clay, hardpan substratum, drained, 0 to 1 percent slopes” and “128-Cosumnes silt loam, drained, 0 to 2% slopes” are classified by NRCS as hydric soils (NRCS March 1992). Loam is described as soils containing 7 – 27% clay, 28 – 50% silt, and less than 52% sand.

115-Clear Lake clay, hardpan substratum, drained, 0 to 1 percent slopes. This very deep and deep, artificially drained soil is in basins. Permeability is slow. Available water capacity is moderate. The depth to a seasonal high water table is mainly 60 to 72 inches in winter and early spring, but it can be at a depth of 48 to 60 inches for short periods. The shrink-swell potential is high. Runoff is very slow. Water erosion is a slight hazard or is not a hazard at all. The soil is subject to rare flooding.

The main limitations affecting urban uses are the high shrink-swell potential, low strength, the depth to a seasonal high water table, the slow permeability, the very slow runoff, the flooding, and the sloughing. Sloughing is a hazard in shallow excavations, such as trenches and holes. Proper design and grading specifications can minimize the limitations of the Clear Lake clay soils.

128-Cosumnes silt loam, drained, 0 to 2% slopes. This very deep, artificially drained soil is on low flood plains. Permeability is slow. Available water capacity is high. The water table is high because of seepage and generally is maintained below a depth of 36 inches by pumping. The shrink-swell potential is high. Runoff is very slow. Water erosion is a slight hazard. The soil is subject to rare flooding.

213-San Joaquin silt loam, leveled, 0 to 1 percent slopes. This soil is moderately well drained, permeability is very slow, runoff is very slow and erosion is a slight hazard or is not a hazard at all. The shrink-swell potential is high.

214-San Joaquin silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes. This moderately deep, moderately well drained soil is on low terraces. Permeability is very slow. Water is perched above the claypan for short periods after heavy rainfall in winter and early spring and after heavy irrigation. Available water capacity is low. Runoff is slow and erosion is a slight. The shrink-swell potential is high.
Regulatory Setting

Sacramento City Code
SCC Title 15.20 Uniform Building Code (UBC), 15.84 Official Grades, and 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Controls provide standards and specifications that ensure that soil erosion potential is minimized. UBC also regulates development to assure that structural damage resulting from soil hazards, liquefaction, and ground shaking during an earthquake will be less than significant.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES)
Point source discharge of pollutants into "navigable water" is regulated through the NPDES. All point source discharges must have an NPDES permit (33 U.S.C. 1311). Ground disturbing activities, such as grading, in excess of 5 acres requires an NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving fault rupture?

Answer: No. No known faults or Alquist-Priolo special studies zones occur in or adjacent to the City of Sacramento, therefore no known hazard of surface rupture exists (SGPU, T-3).

b) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential impact: The project proposes to develop 242.6 acres in a “moderate” earthquake severity zone. Thirteen major faults occur within a 62 mi radius of the City of Sacramento. The SGPU reports that the City of Sacramento occurs in the CDMG “low” and “moderate” earthquake severity zones corresponding to the probable maximum intensity of VII-VIII (Modified Mercalli Scale).

The SCC 15.20 UBC provides standards and specifications to assure that structural damage resulting from ground shaking during an earthquake will be less than significant.

Level of Significance: Adherence to SCC 15.20 UBC reduces potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The project proposes to develop 242.6 acres within a liquefaction opportunity zone. The SGPU reports that the City of Sacramento is within the liquefaction opportunity zone (5.5 – 8.5 on the Richter Scale) of maximum credible earthquakes. Only through geologic mapping, based on deep subsoil borings, can liquefaction potential can be estimated.

The SCC 15.20 UBC provides standards and specifications to assure that structural damage resulting from liquefaction during ground shaking earthquakes will be less than significant.

Level of Significance: Adherence to SCC 15.20 UBC reduces potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
d) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving landslides?

Answer: No. The project site has little topographical relief. The proposed project does not occur in an area subject to landslides.

e) Would the proposal result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The project will require grading of 242.6 acres. The grading of 242.6 acres could increase the potential for soil erosion. However, erosion hazards throughout the SGPU area are considered less than significant (SGPU, T-18). SCC Title 15 Chapter 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Controls provides standards and specifications that ensure that soil erosion potential is minimized. This project is subject to an NPDES permit program administered by RWQCB. Because the project proposes to disturb more than 5 acres of soil, the project proponent is required to obtain an NPDES permit from RWQCB. The preparation of a SWPPP is a requirement of the NPDES permit. Adherence to the NPDES permit policy will minimize potential erosion impacts.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

f) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The project proposes to develop 242.6 acres of residential and mixed-use on soils identified by NRCS to have high shrink-swell potential. Development on expansive soils could subject property to the hazard of structural damage (SGPU, T-18).

Test data indicate that the clays present within the upper two to eight feet across most of the property are of moderate to high plasticity and have significant potential for developing swelling pressures with variations in moisture content (Raney 2000b). Expansive clays can cause distress to floor slabs, foundations, and flatwork unless special measures are undertaken (Raney 2000b). Due to the high expansion potential of most soils on the site, chemical treatment or over-excavation to a depth of 24 inches would be required to provide adequate reduction in expansive soil movements (Raney 2000b). A post-tensioned slab foundation system can be effective at reducing expansive soil effects (Raney 2000b). The final alternative presented in the Raney report is a reinforced conventional foundation and slabs together with soil pre-saturation (Raney 2000b). The Raney reports provide specific design and procedure recommendations and specifications to reduce potential significant effects from soil expansion. Copies of the Raney reports are available at the City of Sacramento.

The SCC 15.20 UBC also provides standards and specifications to assure that structural damage resulting from expansive soils will be less than significant.

Level of Significance: Adherence to the recommendations of the Raney reports and to SCC 15.20 UBC reduces potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

g) Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Answer: Potential impact.
**Potential Impact:** The proposed project study area is located on level and stable terrain. No segment of the project is anticipated to be subject to on-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Development within the SGPU area would not subject property to any known or inferred hazard of damage due to subsidence (SGPU, T-18).

Raney encountered groundwater at a depth of 13 feet on the lower north end of the northerly portion of the project study area (Raney 2000a). On the southerly portion, groundwater was encountered between seven to 18 feet (Raney 2000a). Raney’s experience in the area indicates that groundwater levels fluctuate with rainfall and irrigation/drainage practices (Raney 2000a). On the lowest elevations onsite, groundwater levels can rise within a few feet of the surface (Raney 2000a). On most intermediate elevations of the site, groundwater levels of between five and ten feet below the ground surface can be expected (Raney 2000a). Based on this information Raney anticipates that the permanent groundwater table will remain at least a few feet below building pad levels and will not have a significant effect on the completed housing construction (Raney 2000a).

Utility excavations approaching ten feet or more in depth may encounter groundwater year round (Raney 2000a). Because of the low permeability of surface soils within the upper eight feet of the soil profile, the quantity of groundwater inflow into shallow excavations is expected to be relatively minor (Raney 2000a). Subgrades cut within a few feet of the groundwater level may have high moisture contents that render them unstable under construction equipment (Raney 2000a). Stabilization procedures such as chemical treatment or use of geotextile fabric and rock may be required on road subgrades (Raney 2000a). Due to poor drainage, surface and near surface clayey soils can become saturated and unstable during the wet season (Raney 2000a). Saturated soils would require considerable aeration to achieve a moisture content that will allow compaction (Raney 2000a). This condition should be considered in scheduling earthwork construction (Raney 2000a). The Raney reports provide specific design and procedure recommendations and specifications to reduce potential significant effects from groundwater levels. Copies of the Raney reports are available at the City of Sacramento.

The SCC 15.20 UBC also provides standards and specifications to assure that structural damage and risks to construction equipment resulting from high groundwater levels will be less than significant.

**Level of Significance:** Adherence to the recommendations of the Raney reports and to SCC 15.20 UBC reduces potential impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
4. Water

Would the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Changes in currents, or the course, or direction of water movements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Impacts on groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria for Determining Significance

The potential for significant impacts on hydrologic conditions and water quality from construction activities was evaluated based on the intensity, duration, and timing of the various disturbances on aquatic and riparian resources.

State water quality standards (WQSs) set criteria for parameters which these ranges of values to represent threshold values over (or under) which the exceedance may become significant. The location and magnitude of an impact influence whether a parameter will be significantly affected (personal communication, S. McConnell, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region). The WQS for construction projects is the disturbance of 5 or more acres of soil. Disturbance of 5 or more acres of soil requires an NPDES permit from the RWQCB.

### Impact Mechanisms

Potential construction-related impact mechanisms for water quality include the following:

- Grading associated soil disturbance could cause increased erosion and sedimentation in drainages and wetlands. Construction equipment could compact soils, leading to accelerated runoff and concentration in localized areas prone to sheet erosion and gullyiting. Disturbing ditch lines, which function as extensions of the stream network, also could result in fine sediment deposition into natural stream courses.

- Hazardous materials associated with the proposed project will be limited to those substances associated
with construction equipment, such as gasoline and diesel fuels, engine oil, and hydraulic fluids. An accidental spill of these substances could contaminate drainages, soils, wetlands, and other environmentally sensitive areas.

Potential operation-related impact mechanisms for water quality include the following:

- Reduction of permeable surfaces resulting from development, including asphalt-paved areas, could cause increased urban run-off into the existing stormwater system.
- Hazardous materials, such as gasoline and diesel fuels, engine oil, and hydraulic fluids, could be contributed to the stormwater system.

**Environmental Setting**

The proposed project is located on the northwest corner of the San Juan Road overpass at Interstate 5, in the City of Sacramento, CA. The project study area occurs on the Taylor Monument USGS Topographic Quadrangle (T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project is located within the SGPU area and the NNCP area. Elevation of the project study area ranges from 3 feet above sea level to 15 feet above sea level. Terrain in the project study area exhibits very little relief. The project site drains from the northeast to the southwest.

The Sacramento flood control system diminishes the extent of flood hazard areas, and no portions of the SGPU area beyond the leveed channels and floodplains of the American and Sacramento Rivers are subject to flooding by a 100-year run-off event (SGPU, W-3). However, several portions of the American and Sacramento rivers are subject to flooding by a 100-year event (SGPU, W-5). No portion of the proposed project is subject to flooding from overflow of local creeks and drainage canals during a 100-year event (SGPU, W-5).

No portion of the proposed project occurs in a 100-year floodplain (personal communication, D. Schamber, City of Sacramento Department of Utilities). The Water Division of the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, provides water to the project site. City water is provided to areas in the City as they develop. Placement and sizing of water transmission and distribution lines are determined by City Staff. After the water distribution facilities have been installed, the City operates and maintains the system (SGPU, H-7).

**Regulatory Setting**

The City of Sacramento General Plan

The Water Division of the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, provides water to the project site. City water is provided to areas in the City as they develop. Placement and sizing of water transmission and distribution lines are determined by City Staff. After the water distribution facilities have been installed, the City operates and maintains the system (SGPU, H-7).

The North Natomas Community Plan

Prior to any development occurring, the City Utilities Department must verify that adequate water supply system capacity exists to serve the specific project or will be provided through a funded program and/or a condition of approval of the project (NNCP, 74).

Sacramento City Code

SCC Title 15.20 Uniform Building Code (UBC) 15.84 Official Grades, and 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control (EC) are the City's standards and specifications that ensure that soil erosion potential is minimized. SCC Title 15.82.260 Post-construction Erosion and Sediment Control (PC plan) is required for all projects to control surface run-off and erosion and sediment on a particular site after all planned final improvements and/or structures have been installed or erected. The PC plan shall be prepared and submitted concurrently with the final grading plan.
design, installation, and management of landscapes in order to utilize available plant, water, land, and human resources.

**National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit**

Point source discharge of pollutants into "navigable water" is regulated through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES). All point source discharges must have an NPDES permit (33 U.S.C. 1311). Ground disturbing activities, such as grading, in excess of 5 acres requires an NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is a requirement of the NPDES permit. Hazardous material spill prevention and spill cleanup Best management practices (BMPs), set-forth by the California Stormwater Task Force, March 1993, are included in the SWPPP. Adherence to the SWPPP reduces the potential for accidental discharge of hazardous materials to a level of less than significant and minimizes potential impacts to water quality.

**Impact Assessment**

a) **Would the proposal result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?**

   **Answer:** Potential impact.

   **Potential Impact:** The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface area on the project site. The increase in the amount of impervious area would increase the amount of surface runoff. The impervious surfaces will require an on-site storm drain system to deliver runoff from the site to Detention Basin 7a and the Natomas West Drainage Canal.

   Storm water from building rooifs will be routed either directly into the underground storm drainage system or will drain from roof down spouts across paved areas and be collected in parking lot drain inlets. The parking lots will sheet drain into on-site drain inlets. The on-site drainage system will discharge to a pipe system that is connected to Detention Basin 7a. Detention Basin 7a provides water quality treatment and regulates the discharge of drainage to 0.1cfs/acre for storms up to the 100-year return storm.

   **Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

   **Mitigation Measures:** None required.

   **Significance after Mitigation:** None required.

b) **Would the proposal result in exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding?**

   **Answer:** No. The proposed project does not occur within a 100-year flood plain.

   The River View PUD Guidelines stipulate that design must conform to the CFMP. The Guidelines state that all new residential subdivisions shall identify public refuge locations or have a minimum of 50% of residential units with a top plate at or above the base flood elevation. Public refuge locations must be located within one mile of the site and may include commercial and office buildings, levees, schools, or other public facilities with roof access. Each development within the River View PUD is required to obtain a Special Permit prior to approval. Evidence that the project conforms to the CFMP is a condition of the Special Permit approval.

c) **Would the proposal result in discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?**

   **Answer:** Potential impact.

   **Potential Impact:** Grading activities could temporarily result in a minimal increase in siltation and sedimentation into the existing stormwater system. The project as proposed will require grading of 242.6 acres for the development of the project site. The project is subject to the Comprehensive Stormwater
Management Plan and SCC Title 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Controls, which provides standards and specifications that ensure that impacts to water quality are minimized during construction activities. Under SCC Title 15.88.260 Post-construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (PC plan), the project is required to prepare a PC plan. The PC Plan controls surface runoff and erosion and retains sediment on a particular site after construction. These standards and specifications conform to the Precautionary Measures for Construction outlined in the SGPU.

This project is regulated by the NPDES administered by RWQCB. Because the project proposes to disturb more than 5 acres of soil, the project proponent is required to obtain an NPDES permit from RWQCB.

Level of Significance: Adherence to SCC and the NPDES permit requirements will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d) Would the proposal result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Potential Impact: Urban runoff from the residential and mixed-use development would increase the amount of surface runoff to Natomas West Drainage Canal and then to the Sacramento River. However, the project is subject to the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program and SCC Title 15.88.260 Post-construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (PC plan). The project is required to prepare a PC plan. The PC Plan controls surface runoff and erosion and retains sediment on a particular site after construction. These standards and specifications conform to the Precautionary Measures for Construction outlined in the SGPU. Adherence to the City’s regulations would be effective in reducing the volume of surface runoff from the site.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d) Would the proposal result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impact: Urban runoff from the residential and mixed-use development would increase the amount of surface runoff to Natomas West Drainage Canal and then to the Sacramento River. However, the project is subject to the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program and SCC Title 15.88.260 Post-construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (PC plan). The project is required to prepare a PC plan. The PC Plan controls surface runoff and erosion and retains sediment on a particular site after construction. These standards and specifications conform to the Precautionary Measures for Construction outlined in the SGPU. Adherence to the City’s regulations would be effective in reducing the volume of surface runoff from the site.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e) Would the proposal result in changes in currents, or the course, or direction of water movements?

Answer: No. The project will not directly affect any watercourse.

f) Would the proposal result in a change in the quantity of groundwaters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?

Answer: No. Agricultural wells within the project study area will be taken out of service. Therefore, the proposed project would decrease withdrawals from the groundwater supply.

g) Would the proposal result in altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

Answer: No.

h) Would the proposal result in impacts on groundwater quality?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The proposed project will develop 242.6 acres of residential and mixed-use land uses. The project would result in an increase in pollutants generated in the area. Pollutants from urban uses may arise from erosion of disturbed areas, deposition of particles derived from automobile exhaust, corrosion or decay of building materials, rainfall contact with toxic substances, decomposition of plant materials, and spills of toxic materials on surfaces which receive rainfall. However, the project will reduce the area
of permeable soil, causing runoff. Furthermore, the soils that occur on the project site were identified by NRCS as having slow to very slow permeability (NRCS April 1993). Impacts of pollutants contributed by the project are likely to be concentrated as runoff and not as recharge of the groundwater supply. Detention Basin 7a provides water quality treatment of runoff resulting from the project.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**i) Would the proposal result in substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?**

**Answer:** No. Agricultural wells within the project study area will be taken out of service. Therefore, the proposed project would decrease withdrawals from the groundwater supply. Furthermore, 75% of the City of Sacramento obtains water from surface sources.
5. Air Quality

Would the proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Create objectionable odors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The “Air Quality Thresholds of Significance” manual (Manual; 1994 First Edition) published by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) provides the means to identify the potential significant adverse impacts of the proposed project. The Manual evaluates projects in three phases: Phase I (grading phase), Phase II (construction of roadways, structures, and facilities), and Operational Phase (long-term emissions). Significance thresholds for the three phases of a project are listed below.

**Phase I Quantitative Short-term Emission Thresholds**

- Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) = 85 pounds per day (ppd)
- Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) = 85 ppd
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10) = 275 ppd

**Phase II Quantitative Short-term Emission Thresholds**

- ROG = 85 ppd
- NOx = 85 ppd
- PM10 = 275 ppd

**Operational Phase Quantitative Long-term Emission Thresholds**

- ROG = 85 ppd
- NOx = 85 ppd
- PM10 = 275 ppd

**Ambient Air Quality – Emissions Concentrations**

The California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) are the criteria for emissions concentrations significance. A project (or project phase) is considered significant if:

1) The project’s contribution violates CAAQS CO threshold of 20.00 parts per million (ppm) in peak 1-hour or 9.00 ppm in 8-hour samples; or

2) The project’s contribution plus the background level violates the CAAQS CO threshold of 20.00 ppm in peak 1-hour or 9.00 ppm in 8-hour samples; and
   a) A sensitive receptor is located within a quarter-mile of the project, or
   b) The project’s contribution exceeds five percent of the CAAQS threshold of 20.00 ppm in peak 1-hour or 9.00 ppm in 8-hour samples.
Qualitative Long-term Emission Thresholds

- Potential to create or be near an objectionable odor.
- Potential for accidental release of air toxic emissions or acutely hazardous materials.
- Potential to emit an air toxic contaminant regulated by SMAQMD or listed on a federal or state air toxic list.
- Burning of hazardous, medical, or municipal waste as waste-to-energy facility.
- Potential to produce a substantial amount of wastewater or potential for toxic discharge.
- Sensitive receptors located within a quarter mile of toxic emissions or near CO hot spots.
- Carcinogenic or toxic contaminant emissions that exceed or contribute to an exceedence of SMAQMD action level for cancer (one in one million), chronic and acute risks.

On page A-3 of the Manual (SMAQMD), Table A-4 identifies the approximate size of some typical development types that may have emissions that exceed the quantitative thresholds listed above. The trigger levels are intended as a general indication of projects that are near the threshold and do not necessarily obviate the model for analysis provided in the Manual (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD recommends further analysis for projects within 10% of the trigger level.

Significance Criteria Trigger Levels

- Single Family Housing: 340 dwelling units
- Office Park: 290,000 square feet

Impact Mechanisms

Dust created during construction and emissions from Phase I and Phase II construction activities (including vehicle trips from construction employees) are sources of impacts on air quality. Long-term impacts on air quality arise from vehicle trips to and from residential and employment center land uses during the Operational Phase.

Environmental Setting

The project site is located within the Sacramento Valley, which is bounded by the coast range to the west and the Sierra Nevada to the east. A sea level gap in the Coast Range is located to the southwest and the intervening terrain is flat. The prevailing wind direction is from the southwest, resulting in marine breezes. During the winter, northerly winds occur more frequently, but southerly winds predominate.

The air quality of a region is determined by the air pollutant emissions (quantities and type of pollutants measured by weight) and by ambient air quality (the concentration of pollutants within a specified volume of air). Air pollutants are characterized as primary and secondary pollutants. Primary pollutants are those emitted directly into the air, for example carbon monoxide (CO), and can be traced to a single pollutant source. Secondary pollutants are those pollutants that form through chemical reactions in the atmosphere, for example reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOX) combine to form ozone.

The SGPU identified urban emission sources in the Sacramento Valley as the primary source of air quality problems (SGPU, Z-6). The NNCP area comprises 14.4% of the SGPU area (SGPU, Z-16). The SGPU found that, at the time of the SGPU's preparation, North Natomas was contributing approximately 0.21% of the region's ROG and 0.19% of the region's NOx emissions. The SGPU found that after plan build out traffic originating in the NNCP area would produce 1.97% of the region's ROG and 1.77% of the region's NOx traffic emissions (SGPU, Z-59). The SGPU states that (SGPU, Z-60), "Traffic-related emission increases associated with build out of the SGPU would worsen existing ozone problems in the Sacramento region. This represents an unavoidable significant adverse impact."

The SGPU found that, at the time of the SGPU's preparation, roadways in North Natomas were generally uncongested and, as a result, no part of the NNCP area exceeded federal or state 1-hour and 8-hour standards for CO (SGPU, Z-52). The intersection of Interstate 5 and Interstate 80 was estimated to exceed the state 1-hour standard and the federal and state 8-hour standards for CO after SGPU build out (SGPU, Z-52). Violations of CO air quality standards are also expected at congested intersections of major arterials in North
Natomas (SGPU, Z-69). The SGPU states that (SGPU, Z-69), "Mitigation measures are not expected to reduce projected CO concentrations to a level below state and federal standards. Therefore, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are expected in this area."

Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. Residential development in the Gateway West PUD occurs west of the project site, north of Detention Basin 7a. Land north of the project site is currently vacant, but will be developed as Employment Center — 50 (EC — 50) by the Gateway West PUD. The River View PUD is planned south of San Juan Road. The Gateway West PUD residential development is the only sensitive receptor within the vicinity of the project study area.

The River View PUD Development Guidelines, which would be amended to include the Parkview project, provide an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy that includes its Transportation Systems Management Strategy. The following design features would lead to a reduction in ROG emissions generated by the project by reducing single-occupancy vehicles:

1) Density Clusters: Densities within the PUD have been clustered. Multi-family sites, which will have the highest concentration of residents, are located adjacent to neighborhood commercial and employment center uses. This allows easy and convenient access to shopping and employment.

2) Street System Design: The PUD is based on a system of interconnected streets that diffuse traffic throughout the community by providing a choice of routes. The result is to minimize traffic congestion during peak hours. Where cul-de-sacs are utilized, most open onto park, open space and trail amenity, or access corridor providing direct access for pedestrians and bicyclists to the circulation system.

3) Pedestrian and Bicycle System: The PUD provides on-street and off-street trails for bikes and pedestrians. As designed, bikes and pedestrians are able to access parks, open space areas, commercial, and employment centers from residential neighborhoods while remaining on a trail.

4) Shade Trees: The PUD design includes shade trees along all streets. While providing an attractive environment, the trees will encourage people to walk or cycle even during the hot summer months.

Regulatory Setting

The Federal Clean Air Act of 1967, as amended, established air quality standards for several pollutants. These standards are divided into primary and secondary standards. Primary standards are designed to protect public health and secondary standards are designed to protect other values. California has adopted its own, more stringent, standards.

The state 1-hour ozone standard is 0.10 ppm, by volume, not to be equaled or exceeded. The federal 1-hour standard for ozone is 0.12 ppm, not to be exceeded more than once per year. State and federal CO standards have been set for both 1-hour and 8-hour averaging times. The state 1-hour CO standard is 20 ppm, while the federal standard is 35 ppm. Both state and federal 8-hour CO standards are set at 9 ppm. The state 24-hour PM$_{10}$ standard is 50 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu$g/m$^3$) and annual PM$_{10}$ standard is 30 $\mu$g/m$^3$. The federal 24-hour and annual PM$_{10}$ standards are 50 $\mu$g/m$^3$.

In 1997, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) designated the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area as a non-attainment area for ozone and CO. The Sacramento Valley Air Basin was designated a non-attainment area for ozone, CO, and PM$_{10}$ under the provisions of the California Clean Air Act (ARB-T, 1990).

Sacramento Air Quality Management District

District Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust will apply during the construction phases of the project. District Rule 403 states that:

A person shall take every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates, from any construction, handling or storage activity, or any wrecking, excavation, grading, clearing of land or solid waste disposal operation. Reasonable precautions shall include, but are not limited to:

- Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for control of dust in the demolition of existing buildings
or structures, construction operations, the construction of roadways or the clearing of land.

- Application of asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, materials stockpiles, and other surfaces which can give rise to airborne dusts;
- Other means approved by the Air Pollution Control Officer.

**City of Sacramento General Plan**

The SGPU includes the following goals and policies that pertain to air quality management (SGPU, C-43 – C-44):

**Circulation Element**

Overall Goals – Goal C: Maintain a desirable quality of life including good air quality while supporting planned land use and population growth.

Transportation Planning – Goal A: Work toward a comprehensive transportation plan that identifies needs, integrates the existing transportation network with plan growth and proposes new facilities.

Goal A – Policy 6: Develop an Air Quality Improvement Program, which will include strategies and specific programs that reduce air pollution.

**North Natomas Community Plan**

The NNCP Air Quality Mitigation Strategy focuses on reducing emissions of ozone precursor, especially ROG emissions (NNCP, 48). Emissions problems are amenable to solution through implementation of Transportation Systems Management Programs (TSM) and localized traffic flow improvement measures, design and arrangement of site, structures, parking, and landscaping (NNCP, 48). The NNCP includes the following goals and policies that pertain to air quality management (NNCP, 48 – 49):

**Air Quality Mitigation Strategy**

A. Development in North Natomas shall comply with the Federal and California Clean Air Acts.

B. The Air Quality Mitigation Strategy shall have as a goal a 35% community-wide daily reduction in vehicle and other related reactive organic compound emissions at build out. The base on-road vehicle emission level prior to reduction will be established from an all single occupancy vehicle condition,

C. Structure the community and each development to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips.

Implementing Policies:

**Achieve 35 Percent Reduction in Emissions:** The City Planning and Public Works Departments with the SMAQMD will verify that a 35% community-wide reduction in projected ROG emissions will result from successful implementation of the Air Quality Strategy.

- **Residential Development:** All new residential developments must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 20% compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline.

- **Non-Residential Development:** All new non-residential developments must reduce ROG emissions by a minimum of 50% compared to the single occupant vehicle baseline.

**Promote Electric, Other Zero-Emission, and Low-Emission Vehicle Use:** Encourage the use of electric, other zero-emission, and low-emission vehicles by providing sufficient, convenient, electric vehicle charging and parking facilities in the planning of residential and employment developments.

**Sacramento City Code**

SCC Title 15 Buildings and Construction provides direction for dust abatement measures. These measures help ensure the limitation of PM$_{10}$ impacts to the Sacramento Valley Air Basin during Phase I and Phase II construction activities.
SCC Title 17.184 Transportation Systems Management Program (TSM) establishes TSM requirements for employers and developers within the city in order to meet the 35 percent trip reduction goal. These requirements promote alternative commute modes in order to reduce traffic congestion, optimize use of the transportation system, and improve air quality.

Development Requirements
A. Minor Projects (25 – 99 employees). The property owner of every minor project shall provide the facilities to post information on alternative commute modes. Also, the property owner shall coordinate with the appropriate transit agency(s) and regional ridesharing agency to maintain and provide current information.

B. Major Projects (100 or more employees). The property owner of every major project shall be required to obtain a transportation management plan (TMP) permit subject to approval by the planning director and the traffic engineer.

The approval shall be conditioned upon compliance with the following provisions:

1. Comply with the regulations applicable to minor projects as specified in subsection A of this section.

2. Designate a transportation coordinator for the project.

3. Agree to provide an annual status report to the city in a format to be specified by the traffic engineer. At a minimum, this report shall document:

   a. Commute modes of all employees currently occupying the project,

   b. Progress toward attainment of the alternative commute mode goal of the city,

   c. If alternative commute mode goal has not been attained, a plan for additional TSM measures shall be implemented;

4. Prepare an approved TMP to provide facilities and a framework for services conducive to attaining the alternative commute mode goal designated for the project.

The measures to be included in the TMP shall be selected by the applicant; however, the planning director and traffic engineer may deny the applicant the right to utilize a particular measure(s) if the standards specified for that measure(s) are not met. After approval by the planning director and traffic engineer, the plan shall be binding upon the property owner and any successors in interest.

The plan obligations shall either be included in the covenants, conditions and restrictions prepared for the development and recorded as part of that document, or separately recorded. The filing fee for this permit shall be in an amount specified by resolution of the city council. At any time after the original plan has been approved, the property owner may request modification of the plan by filing an application and processing fee, in the amount specified by resolution of the city council.

Implementation requirements and methods for compliance shall be contained in the developer TSM handbook. The City Transportation Engineer and City Planning Director shall perform the actual calculation of credits toward meeting the 35% trip reduction goal. These calculations shall take into account the package of measures.

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Answer: Potential Impact. The Sacramento Valley Air Basin is a non-attainment area for ozone precursors (ROG and NOx), PM10, and CO. The project will contribute ROG, NOx, PM10, and CO emissions into the non-attainment area during Phase I, Phase II, and the Operational Phase of the project.
Potential Impact: Phase I – Short-term Emissions

Phase I (grading activities) will generate emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10. The Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing is 340 dwelling units and for Office Park 290,000 ft². The project proposes to develop 1,090 residential dwelling units and 870,000 ft² of office space. The proposed project exceeds the Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing by 31% and for Office Park by 33%. The percentage far exceeds the 10% allowed in the Manual (SMAQMD, A-3) and obviates the necessity to estimate potential emissions. The SMAQMD has also indicated that unless it is known what specific equipment the contractor will use (year, make, and model) and for what duration the contractor will use the equipment, estimating emissions for Phase I and Phase II is not accurate enough to be reliable (personal communication, P. Stafford, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District).

The project is subject to SCC Title 15.40.050 Construction Site Regulations, Control Dust and Mud and SMAQMD District Rule 403.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: The SMAQMD provided the following mitigation measures to reduce the emission of ROG, NOx, and PM10 (personal communication, P. Stafford, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District).

MM 5-1 Prior to approval, all grading plans will show that the construction contractor shall enclose, cover, or water all soil piles twice daily.

MM 5-2 Prior to approval, all grading plans will show that the construction contractor shall water all exposed soil twice daily.

MM 5-3 Prior to approval, all grading plans will show that the construction contractor shall water all haul roads twice daily.

MM 5-4 Prior to approval, all grading plans will show that the construction contractor shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard on trucks when hauling loads.

MM 5-5 Prior to approval, all grading plans will show that the City of Sacramento permits grading of the project site based on the following schedule:
  • One piece of equipment may grade for no more than 12 hours per day.
  • Two pieces of grading equipment may grade for no more than 6 hours per day.
  • Three pieces of grading equipment may grade for no more than 4 hours per day.
  • Four pieces of grading equipment may grade for no more than 3 hours per day.
  • Five pieces of grading equipment may grade for no more than 2 hours per day.

MM 5-6 The prime contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City of Sacramento demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, and operated by either the prime contractor or any subcontractor, will achieve a fleet-averaged 20% NOx reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent California Air Resources Board fleet average.

MM 5-7 The prime contractor shall submit to the City of Sacramento a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the prime contractor shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.

MM 5-8 The prime contractor shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the City of Sacramento shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be
submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supercede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.

**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

**Potential Impact: Phase II – Short-term Emissions**
Phase II (construction activities) will generate emissions of ROG, NO\textsubscript{x}, and PM\textsubscript{10}. The proposed project exceeds the Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing by 31% and for Office Park by 33%. The percentage far exceeds the 10% allowed in the Manual (SMAQMD, A-3) and obviates the necessity to estimate potential emissions.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

**Mitigation Measures:** Implementation of MM 5-1 through MM 5-8 will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Less than significant.

**Potential Impact: Operational Phase – Long-term Emissions**
The Operational Phase will generate emissions of ROG, NO\textsubscript{x}, and PM\textsubscript{10}. The proposed project exceeds the Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing by 31% and for Office Park by 33%. The percentage far exceeds the 10% allowed in the Manual (SMAQMD, A-3) and obviates the necessity to estimate potential emissions.

The SGPU found that after plan build out traffic originating in the NNCP area would produce 1.97% of the region’s ROG and 1.77% of the region’s NO\textsubscript{x} traffic emissions (SGPU, Z-59). The SGPU states that, “Traffic-related emission increases associated with build out of the SGPU would worsen existing ozone problems in the Sacramento region. This represents an unavoidable significant adverse impact (SGPU, Z-60).” Violations of CO air quality standards are also expected at congested intersections of major arterials in North Natomas (SGPU, Z-69). The SGPU states that, “Mitigation measures are not expected to reduce projected CO concentrations to a level below state and federal standards. Therefore, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are expected in this area (SGPU, Z-69).”

Of the 242.6 acres of the Parkview project site, the SGPU designated 223.4 acres for development as Low Density Residential, Mixed Use, and Public/Quasi-Public land uses. The project proposes an amendment of the SGPU to designate 220.5 acres for Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Mixed Use, and Public/Quasi-Public land uses. The remaining 2.9 acres would be an increase in the Park/Recreation/Open Space land use designation. The proposed project is mostly consistent with the original SGPU land use designations. The major difference is the addition of 29.7 acres designated for Medium Density Residential. The SGPU planned for development of the site and found that air quality impacts are unavoidable.

The SGPU aims to reduce ROG, NO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and CO emissions through the implementation of the Circulation Element’s Transportation Planning goals and objectives (i.e., strategies and specific programs that reduce air pollution). Likewise, the NNCP strives to improve air quality by setting the goal of a 35% trip reduction at build out. To achieve its goals, the City of Sacramento has implemented the TSM program, through SCC Title 17.184. SCC Title 17.184.10 establishes the requirements for employers and developers to meet the 35% trip reduction goal. SCC Title 17.184 requires major projects to prepare a TSM and to obtain a TMP permit prior to project approval. The City Transportation Engineer and City Planning Director evaluate the TSM and TMP and calculate the actual trip reduction.

The existing River View PUD Development Guidelines provide features that will help to reduce the single-occupancy vehicle trips. The proposed project will be required to either update the existing TSM
for the River View PUD or prepare one of its own. The TSM and TMP are subject to approval by the City of Sacramento.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant. The project site was evaluated in the SGPU for development as a residential and mixed use development. The unavoidable significant adverse impacts on air quality resulting from build out of the general plan have been identified on a program level.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**b) Would the proposal expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?**

**Answer:** Potential impact. The U.S. EPA established National Air Quality Standards and the California Air Resources Board also established ambient air quality standards. The project will emit concentrations of CO that could expose sensitive receptors to pollutants.

**Potential Impact: Phase I. and Phase II. — Short-term Ambient Air Quality**

Phase I (grading activities) and Phase II (construction activities) will contribute CO emissions to the ambient air quality. The proposed project exceeds the Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing by 31% and for Office Park by 33%. The percentage far exceeds the 10% allowed in the Manual (SMAQMD, A-3) and obviates the necessity to estimate potential emissions.

The only sensitive receptor near the project site is the residential development in the Gateway West PUD west of the property. However, Phase I and Phase II CO emissions will be temporary and are not anticipated to affect substantial numbers of people.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measures:** Implementation of MM 5-1 through MM 5-8 will be sufficient to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Less than significant.

**Potential Impact: Operational Phase— Long-term Ambient Air Quality**

The Operational Phase of the proposed project will contribute CO emissions to the ambient air quality. The proposed project exceeds the Significance Criteria Trigger Levels for Single Family Housing by 31% and for Office Park by 33%. The percentage far exceeds the 10% allowed in the Manual (SMAQMD, A-3) and obviates the necessity to estimate potential emissions.

The intersection of Interstate 5 and Interstate 80 was estimated to exceed the state 1-hour standard and the federal and state 8-hour standards for CO after SGPU build out (SGPU, Z-52). Violations of CO air quality standards are also expected at congested intersections of major arterials in North Natomas (SGPU, Z-69). The SGPU states that (SGPU, Z-69), “Mitigation measures are not expected to reduce projected CO concentrations to a level below state and federal standards. Therefore, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are expected in this area.”

The SGPU aims to reduce ROG, NO, PM10, and CO emissions through the implementation of the Circulation Element’s Transportation Planning goals and objectives (i.e., strategies and specific programs that reduce air pollution). Likewise, the NNCP strives to improve air quality by setting the goal of a 35% trip reduction at build out. To achieve its goals, the City of Sacramento has implemented the TSM program, through SCC Title 17.184. SCC Title 17.184.10 establishes the requirements for employers and developers to meet the 35% trip reduction goal. SCC Title 17.184 requires major projects to prepare a TSM and to obtain a TMP permit prior to project approval. The City Transportation Engineer and City Planning Director evaluate the TSM and TMP and calculate the actual trip reduction.

The existing River View PUD Development Guidelines provide features that will help to reduce the single-occupancy vehicle trips. The proposed project will be required to either update the existing TSM for the River View PUD or prepare one of its own. The TSM and TMP are subject to approval by the City
of Sacramento.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant. The project site was evaluated in the SGPU for development as a residential and mixed use development. The unavoidable significant adverse impacts on air quality resulting from build out of the general plan have been identified on a program level.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

c) *Would the proposal alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?*

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project will include increasing the acreage of asphalt-paved surface on the project site. The increased area of paved surface could lead to a temperature increase. However, pursuant to the North Natomas Development Guidelines and the River View PUD Development Guidelines, project design includes the planting of shade trees along all streets in the project area. The shade trees would help alleviate potentially rising temperatures.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

d) *Would the proposal create objectionable odors?*

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** Phases I and II of construction will generate odors from diesel exhaust and asphalt paving.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant. The odors will be temporary and would not affect a substantial number of people.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
6. Transportation/ Circulation

Would the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrian or bicyclists?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The City of Sacramento has established a significance threshold for traffic impacts at a level of service (LOS) standard of worse than C. The City has established a 5 second threshold for determining significance of impacts to intersections that already exceed the LOS C standard. The NNCP designates streets to achieve the LOS C standard and an LOS D on freeway ramp and arterial street intersections (NNCP, 38).

Impact Mechanisms

Projects that create a significant increase in traffic, exceed adopted traffic service standards, increase traffic hazards, result in inadequate emergency access, or exceed parking capacity could result in a significant impact.

Environmental Setting

Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 80 (I-80) serve the project, but are not accessed from the project site. The nearest I-5 freeway access from the project site is Del Paso Road and the nearest I-80 freeway access from the project site is West El Camino Avenue. Del Paso Road is an existing east-west arterial street (six lanes) that connects with and provides an overpass over Interstate 5 (I-5). South Loop Road is planned in the NNCP as an east-west arterial street (six lanes) that will provide an overpass over I-5. The planned South Loop Road will bisect the proposed project. The project proposes to change the designation of South Loop Road from an arterial street (six lanes) to residential collector street (two lanes with a center median/lane), still to provide an overpass over I-5. San Juan Road is an existing east-west residential collector street (two lanes with a center median/lane) that serves the project site and provides an overpass over I-5. El Centro Road is an existing north-south collector street (four lanes) that serves the project area. Duckhorn Boulevard is a planned north-south collector street (four lanes) that will bisect the project, such that residential development will occur west of the street and EC–50 development will occur east of the street.

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) is planned serve the project study area. Bus routes on South Loop Road and El Centro Road would provide bus transit service to the project study area.
In addition to the Transportation Systems Management Strategy, the River View PUD Development Guidelines provide for the signalization of intersections when signalization is warranted as deemed necessary by the City Public Works Department. The Public Works Department will evaluate the need for signals, based on Caltrans signal warrants, prior to recordation of each subsequent map phase and/or subsequent Special Permit approval.

**Regulatory Setting**

**City of Sacramento General Plan**

The following goals and policies in the Circulation Element of the SGPU direct transportation and circulation planning decisions in the City of Sacramento and are applicable to the proposed project:

**Overall Goals (SGPU, C-43)**

Goal A: Create a safe, efficient surface transportation network for the movement of people and goods.

Goal B: Provide all citizens in all the communities of the City with access to a transportation network, which serves both the City and region, either by personal vehicles or by transit.

Goal C: Maintain a desirable quality of life including good air quality while supporting planned land use and population growth.

**Transportation Planning (SGPU, C-43 – C-44)**

Goal A: Work toward a comprehensive transportation plan that identifies needs, integrates the existing transportation network with planned growth, and proposes new facilities.

Policy 5: Review development projects for conformance with adopted transportation policies and standards, and require appropriate site improvements.

Policy 6: Develop an Air Quality Improvement Program, which will include strategies and specific programs that reduce air pollution.

**Streets and Roads (SGPU, C-44)**

Goal A: Create a major street system, which will ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within the and through communities and to other areas in the City and region.

Policy 1: Explore actions, which allow for the prioritization, planning, and construction of new facilities.

Goal B: Maintain the quality of the City’s street system.

**Transportation Systems Management (SGPU, C-44)**

Goal A: Increase the commute vehicle occupancy rate by 50%.

Policy 1: Encourage and support programs that increase vehicle occupancy.

Policy 2: Support actions/ordinances/development agreements that reduce peak hour trips.

Goal B: Increase the capacity of the transportation system.

Policy 1: Support programs to improve traffic flow.

**Transit (SGPU, C-46)**

Goal A: Promote a well-designed heavily patronized light rail and transit system.

Policy 1: Provide transit service in newly developing areas at locations, which will support its highest usage.

Policy 2: Consider requiring developers of employment centers needing mitigation of negative transportation impacts to support light rail or bus transit improvements.
Goal B: Encourage some level of transit service in all communities.

Parking (SGPU, C-46)
Goal A: Provide adequate off-street parking for new development and reduce the impact of on street parking in established areas.

Policy 1: Continue to use parking standards, which will provide adequate off-street parking.

Policy 4: Continue to use the preferential parking program in residential areas where traffic and on street parking generated from nonresidential projects would otherwise have a negative impact.

Goal B: Require the parking program to be financially self-supporting.

Pedestrian Ways (SGPU, C-47)
Goal A: Increase the use of the pedestrian mode as a mode of choice for all areas of the City.

Policy 1: Require new subdivisions and planned unit developments to have safe pedestrian walkways that provide direct links between streets and major destinations such as bus stops, schools, parks, and shopping centers.

Policy 2: Encourage new commercial and office establishments, in suburban areas, to front directly on the sidewalk with parking in the rear.

Policy 3: Encourage new commercial and office establishments to develop and enhance pedestrian pathways using planting, trees, and creating pedestrian crosswalks through parking areas or over major barriers such as freeways or canals.

Policy 4: Encourage mixed use developments to generate greater pedestrian activity.

Policy 5: Require developments to provide street-separated pedestrian access to shopping centers, business activity centers, and transit stations.

Bikeways (SGPU, C-47)
Goal A: Develop bicycling as a major transportation mode.

Policy 1: Develop bikeways to facilities commuting to and from major trip generators.

Policy 2: Require major employment centers (50 or more total employees) to install showers, lockers, and secure parking areas for bicyclists as part of any entitlement.

Policy 3: Maintain public bikeways in a manner that promotes their use, by developing a continuous repair and maintenance program.

North Natomas Community Plan
The following Guiding Policies direct City planning decisions in the North Natomas Community:

Circulation (NNCP, 38)
A. Link all land uses with all modes of transportation.

B. Connect, don't isolate, neighborhoods and activity centers within a well-designed circulation system.

C. Encourage an orderly development pattern through phasing that provides for adequate local circulation resulting in completion of the community-wide circulation system.

D. 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.
E. Provide multiple routes and connections to adjacent developments.

**Vehicular Street System (NNCP, 39)**

A. Size and layout of the major street system should be based on traffic projections that assume successful implementation of trip and emission reduction programs.

B. Street system capacity shall be based on no greater than the 2016 traffic projections for North Natomas.

C. Develop street cross-sections that encourage all streets to be as pedestrian friendly as possible.

**Transit System (NNCP, 41)**

A. Because of the interdependence of the transit and land use, transit service must be available for each development phase.

B. Provide hierarchy of transit service including light rail, express buses, local buses, and shuttle buses. The light rail and express bus system serve the inter-community transit needs; the local bus system serves the inter-neighborhood needs; and the local shuttle serves the intra-neighborhood needs.

C. Provide a concentration of density at each phase to support appropriate transit service.

D. Design for phased implementation of transit corridors to accommodate intermediate stages of land use development.

E. Maximize rider access to transit stops and stations.

F. Minimize air quality impacts of transit service by providing a support network for zero-emission transit vehicles.

**Pedestrian/Bikeways (NNCP, 46)**

A. Provide a system of on-street bicycle routes and off-street bicycle paths that connect all residential neighborhoods with activity centers in order to increase the likelihood of a person choosing the bicycle as a commute mode.

B. Create pedestrian circulation opportunities and avoid impeding pedestrian or bicycle circulation with private development.

C. Provide attractive recreational opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

**Transportation Systems Management (NNCP, 47)**

A. Each non-residential project shall comply with the Citywide Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance and a Transportation Management Plan shall be required.

**Air Quality (NNCP, 48)**

A. Development in North Natomas shall comply with the Federal and California Clean Air Acts.

B. The Air Quality Mitigation Strategy shall have as a goal a 35% community-wide daily reduction in vehicle and other related reactive organic compound emissions at build out. The base on-road vehicle emission level prior to reduction will be established from an all single occupancy vehicle condition.

C. Structure the community and each development to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips.

**Parking Management (NNCP, 49)**

A. Parking standards should be set to reasonably accommodate employees and clients for whom alternate mode commuting is not a realistic option.

B. Parking standards must recognize the capacity of transit service and alternative mode commute options and the availability of off-site, on-street parking facilities.
C. Parking standards must maintain the economic viability of the development and should not place any geographic area at a competitive disadvantage.

D. Parking standards must protect residential neighborhoods.

E. Parking standards should include provisions for charging electric vehicles and electric shuttle buses, as well as appropriately sized parking spaces.

F. Sufficient electric service must be provided in parking areas to support the electric transportation needed to be consistent with the air quality requirement of each development.

Sacramento City Code

SCC Title 17.64.020 Parking Requirements By Land Use Type defines the minimum and maximum number of parking spaces that are required by land use type.

SCC Title 17.64.050 F. Handicap Parking Requirements requires parking facilities to comply with the requirements of Title 24 of the Uniform Building Code (SCC Title 15.20).

SCC Title 17.64.050 Bicycle Parking Requirements requires bicycle-parking facilities to be provided and maintained as specified below at a ratio of one bicycle parking facility for every 20 off-street vehicle parking spaces required. Fifty (50) percent of the required bicycle parking facilities shall be Class I. The remaining facilities may be Class I, Class II or Class III.

SCC Title 17.184 Transportation Systems Management Program (TSM) establishes TSM requirements for employers and developers within the city in order to meet the 35 percent trip reduction goal. These requirements promote alternative commute modes in order to reduce traffic congestion, optimize use of the transportation system, and improve air quality. Major projects (100 or more employees and Planned Unit Development projects) are required to prepare a Transportation Management Plan. (Please refer to the discussion of this Title under the Air Quality section above.)

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal result in increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impacts: The proposed project will increase traffic. The City of Sacramento Public Works Department determined that a traffic and circulation study would not be required for the proposed project because the increase in traffic would be consistent with the planned land use designated in the SGPU, NNCP, and the associated traffic impact studies (personal communication, Scott Tobey, City of Sacramento Public Works Department).

The proposed project will contribute to the traffic impacts (degradation of intersections to a sub-LOS C) anticipated in the NNCP EIR and could trigger the necessity to implement the mitigation measures identified in the EIR. These traffic mitigation measures include the installation of traffic signals at affected intersections (e.g., signalization of ramp intersections, ramp metering, and widening of on-ramps for HOV bypass lanes at the Del Paso Road interchange with I-5). As the River View PUD Development Guidelines state, to which the proposed project would be amended, “The Department of Public Works shall determine the need for signals based on Caltrans signal warrants, prior to the recordation of each subsequent phase and/or Special Permit approval. If warranted, signals shall be constructed as part of the public improvements for that phase of the map. Signal design and construction shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and may be subject to reimbursement as set forth in the Development Agreement. The applicant shall provide all onsite easements and rights-of-way needed for turn lanes, signal facilities, and related appurtenances.” Where signalization is constructed offsite, the Development Agreement between the project applicant and the City of Sacramento will stipulate fair-share fees for such improvements.
Because the proposed project is consistent with the certified planning documents and the funding mechanism to implement traffic mitigation measures is in place, the contribution of traffic from the proposed project is considered less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the proposal result in hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Answer: No.

c) Would the proposal result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

Answer: No.

d) Would the proposal result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Answer: No. No building is included in this application. The City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department’s evaluation of the subsequent development for the Special Permit building entitlements will include an evaluation of parking capacity pursuant to SCC Title 17.164.020. The Planning and Building Department will also review the future development for compliance with SCC Title 17.64.050 F. for the project’s consistency with the handicap-parking requirement.

e) Would the proposal result in hazards or barriers for pedestrian or bicyclists?

Answer: No.

f) Would the proposal result in conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Answer: No. The project as proposed is consistent with the plans identified in the SGPU and NNCP. No building is included in this application. The City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department’s evaluation of the subsequent development for the Special Permit building entitlements will include an evaluation of bicycle parking pursuant to SCC Title 17.64.050.

g) Would the proposal result in rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?

Answer: No.
7. **Biological**

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria for Determining Significance**

The following general criteria were considered in determining whether an impact on biological resources would be significant:

- federal or state legal protection of the resource or species;
- federal or state agency regulations and policies;
- local regulations and policies;
- documented resource scarcity and sensitivity both locally and regionally; and
- local and regional distribution and extent of biological resources.

Based on the State CEQA Guidelines and the general criteria identified above, impacts on biological resources were considered significant if the proposed project would result in any of the following:

- conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance;
- long-term degradation of a sensitive plant community because of substantial alteration of land form or site conditions (e.g., alteration of wetland hydrology);
- substantial loss of a plant community and associated wildlife habitat;
- fragmentation or isolation of wildlife habitats, especially riparian and wetland communities;
- substantial disturbance of wildlife resulting from human activities;
- avoidance by fish of biologically important habitat for substantial periods, which may increase mortality or reduce reproductive success;
- disruption of natural wildlife movement corridors;
- substantial reduction in local population size attributable to direct mortality or habitat loss, lowered reproductive success, or habitat fragmentation of:
  - species qualifying as rare and endangered under CEQA,
  - species that are state-listed or federally listed as threatened or endangered, or
  - portions of local populations that are candidates for state or federal listing and federal and state species of concern;
- substantial reduction or elimination of species diversity or abundance.
Impact Mechanisms

Direct and indirect disturbance from project construction could result in the loss or degradation of biological resources through the following ground-disturbing activities:

- grading and site preparation activities;
- temporary stockpiling of soil or construction materials and sidecasting of soil and other construction wastes;
- vegetation removal;
- soil compaction, dust, and water runoff;
- vehicle traffic and equipment and materials transport;
- noise disturbance to wildlife species from construction activities; and
- temporary parking of vehicles outside the construction zone on sites that support sensitive resources (sites not designated as equipment staging areas).

Environmental Setting

Gibson and Skordal Wetland Consultants conducted a jurisdictional delineation on 8 July 1999. Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. (Sycamore Environmental) conducted field surveys of the project study area on 1 and 4 October 2001.

Elevation of the project study area ranges from 7 to 15 ft above sea level. The topography is nearly level, and the site drains from the northeast to the southwest. The project area is bounded to the east by Interstate 5 (I-5) and to the south by San Juan Road. A detention basin (Detention Basin 7a) bounds the southwestern side of the project area. Residential development occurs west of the project site. Land north of the project site is currently vacant.

The majority of the study area consists of tilled annual grassland and nonnative ruderal vegetation. There are two large fill deposits located on the southwest and southeast corners of the study area. An irrigation/drainage ditch is located on the southern border of the study area along San Juan Road. A razed homestead is located on the eastern boundary of the study area near I-5. A group of nonnative trees, two small ditches, and portions of the foundation are the only remnants of the razed homestead. Four blue elderberry shrubs and a small northern California black walnut also occur in this area. Photographs of the project study area are located in Appendix E of the Biological Resources Evaluation for Parkview (P00-022/ P00-023), City of Sacramento, CA prepared by Sycamore Environmental in December 2001 (Appendix B).

Plants

Plant species observed within the project study area include northern California black walnut (Juglans californica var. hindsii), London plane tree (Platanus x acerifolia), white poplar (Populus alba), blue elderberry (Sambucus mexicana), black mustard (Brassica nigra), cocklebur (Xanthium strumarium), yellow star-thistle (Centaurea solstitialis), oat (Avena sp.), ripgut grass (Bromus diandrus), and Mediterranean barley (Hordeum maritimum ssp. gussoneanum).

Sycamore Environmental observed six trees within the project study area that qualified for protection under the City of Sacramento Heritage Tree ordinance (SCC Title 12, chapters 12.64.10 - 12.64.70). Sycamore Environmental contacted the City of Sacramento Arborist, Mr. Dan Pskowski, to determine which trees, if any were to be preserved. Of the six potential heritage trees, Mr. Pskowski is requiring a Valley oak (Quercus lobata) with two trunks totaling 97 inches circumference to be preserved (Appendix A, Figure 11). A complete list of plant species observed is presented in Table 11.
### Table 11. Plant Species Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DICOTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Toxicodendron diversilobum</td>
<td>Western poison oak</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apioaceae</td>
<td>Foeniculum vulgare</td>
<td>Fennel</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocynaceae</td>
<td>Vinca major</td>
<td>Greater periwinkle</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>Centaurea solstitialis</td>
<td>Yellow star-thistle</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lactuca serriola</td>
<td>Prickly lettuce</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picris echioides</td>
<td>Bristly ox-tongue</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silybum marianum</td>
<td>Milk thistle</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidago sp.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xanthium strumarium</td>
<td>Cocklebur</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>Brassica nigra</td>
<td>Black mustard</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raphanus sativus</td>
<td>Radish</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprifoliaceae</td>
<td>Sambucus mexicana</td>
<td>Blue elderberry</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulaceae</td>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
<td>Field bindweed</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus lobata</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglandaceae</td>
<td>Juglans californica var. hindsii</td>
<td>N. California black walnut</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>English walnut</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>Malva sp.</td>
<td>Mallow</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Ficus carica</td>
<td>Edible fig</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morus alba</td>
<td>White mulberry</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleaceae</td>
<td>Olea carica</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanaceae</td>
<td>Platanus × acerifolia</td>
<td>London plane tree</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonaceae</td>
<td>Polygonum sp.</td>
<td>Knotweed</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rumex crispus</td>
<td>Curly dock</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporaceae</td>
<td>Pittosporum sp.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Pyracantha angustifolia</td>
<td>Firethorn</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salicaceae</td>
<td>Populus alba</td>
<td>White poplar</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Populus fremontii ssp. fremontii</td>
<td>Fremont cottonwood</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simaroubaceae</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>Tree-of-heaven</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaricaceae</td>
<td>Tamarix sp.</td>
<td>Tamarisk</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbenaceae</td>
<td>Phyla nodiflora</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitaceae</td>
<td>Vitis sp.</td>
<td>Grape</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONOCOTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td>Avena sp.</td>
<td>Wild oat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bromus diandrus</td>
<td>Ripgut grass</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynodon dactylon</td>
<td>Bermuda grass</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distichlis spicata</td>
<td>Saltgrass</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lolium perenne</td>
<td>Perennial ryegrass</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalaris sp.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorghum halepense</td>
<td>Johnsonsgrass</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = Native to CA; I = Introduced
Wildlife

Wildlife species observed in and near the study area include American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), Northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), rock dove (*Columba livia*), California gull (*Larus californicus*), great egret (*Casmerodius albus*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), and California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*). No raptor nests were observed within or adjacent to the project study area. No amphibian or reptile species were observed. A complete list of wildlife species observed during biological surveys is presented in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12. WILDLIFE SPECIES OBSERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMON NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American kestrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer’s blackbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California gull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great blue heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great egret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern harrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern mockingbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pied-billed grebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-necked pheasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey vulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western meadowlark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western scrub-jay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMMALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California ground squirrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-tailed hare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special-Status Species

File data requested from the USFWS, California Natural Diversity Data Base information (CNDDB/ RareFind report, 1 October 2001), and the results of field surveys were used to determine the species evaluated. A total of 69 CNDDB/ RareFind records for 9 unique species are listed for the Taylor Monument quad. File data requested from the USFWS listing special-status species that could potentially occur within the project corridor is presented in Appendix B of the Biological Resources Evaluation (Sycamore Environmental 2001) in Appendix C.

Listed in Table 13 are special-status species identified in CNDDB/ RareFind records and the USFWS file data for which suitable habitat is present within the project study area. Other special-status species for which habitat is not present, or whose distributional limits preclude the possibility of their occurrence in the project study area, are not discussed further in this report.

In addition to the CNDDB/ RareFind report, Sycamore Environmental reviewed the following current lists prepared by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG):

- State and federally listed endangered and threatened animals of California (October 2001);
- Special animals (July 2001);
- State and federally listed endangered, threatened, and rare plants of California (October 2001); and
- Special vascular plants, bryophytes, and lichens list (July 2001).
Table 13. Special-status Species Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>Listing Status a Federal/ State</th>
<th>Other Codes b USFWS/ DFG</th>
<th>Source c</th>
<th>Observed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmocerus californicus</td>
<td>Valley elderberry</td>
<td>T/-</td>
<td>--/-</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimorphus</td>
<td>longhorn beetle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>Western burrowing owl</td>
<td>--/-</td>
<td>SC/CSC</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo swainsoni</td>
<td>Swainson’s hawk</td>
<td>T/-</td>
<td>--/-</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadrius montanus</td>
<td>Mountain plover</td>
<td>PT/-</td>
<td>--/CSC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamnophis gigas</td>
<td>Giant garter snake</td>
<td>T/T</td>
<td>--/FP</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Listing Status

Federal status determined from USFWS letter. State status determined from *State and federally listed endangered and threatened animals of California* (October 2001) and *State and federally listed endangered, threatened, and rare plants of California* (October 2001) prepared by DFG Natural Diversity Data Base. Codes used in table are as follows:

- E = Endangered;
- T = Threatened;
- P = Proposed;
- R = California Rare;
- * = Possibly extinct.

C = Candidate: Taxa for which the Fish and Wildlife Service has sufficient biological information to support a proposal to list as endangered or threatened.

b Other Codes

Other codes determined from USFWS letter; DFG lists including *Special animals* (July 2001), *Special vascular plants, bryophytes, and lichens* (July 2001); and *CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered vascular plants of California* (CNPS 2001). Codes used in table are as follows:

- SC = USFWS Species of Concern: Taxa for which existing information may warrant listing but for which substantial biological information to support a proposed rule is lacking.
- CSC = DFG “Species of Special Concern.”
- FP = DFG Fully protected
- Prot. = DFG Protected
- CNPS List (plants only): 1A = Presumed Extinct in CA; 1B = Rare or Endangered (R/E) in CA and elsewhere; 2 = R/E in CA and more common elsewhere; 3 = Need more information; 4 = Plants of limited distribution.

c Sources

1 = From the USFWS letter.
2 = From CNDDDB/ RareFind.
3 = Observed by Sycamore Environmental Biologists.

Wetlands and Waters of the United States

A jurisdictional wetland delineation of the project study area was conducted in 1999 (Gibson and Skordal 1999). No wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were reported in the project study area. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) verified the delineation (Appendix C) and determined that no permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be required for the proposed project (Corps Regulatory No. 199900679).

Sensitive Natural Communities

Sensitive natural communities are rare communities recognized by the Natural Diversity Data Base, and includes communities that are adversely affected by minimal disturbance, and select communities that provide habitat for special-status plant or wildlife species. There are no sensitive communities in the project study area.
Regulatory Setting

The following state and federal statutes regulate the proposed project:

- National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).
- Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).
- California Environmental Quality Act (P.R.C. 21000 et seq.).
- California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code 2050 et seq.).
- Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code 1900-1913).
- California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (P.R.C. 5093.50 et seq.).
- Sections 1601-1603 of the California Fish and Game Code that pertain to streambed alterations.

Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act defines ‘take’ (Section 9) and prohibits ‘taking’ of a listed endangered or threatened species (16 U.S.C. 1532, 50 CFR 17.3). If a federally listed species could be harmed by a project, a Section 7 or 10 consultation must be initiated, and an Incidental Take Permit must be obtained (16 U.S.C. 1539, 50 CFR 13).

Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Migratory birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR Part 10 including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 CFR 21). All migratory bird species are protected by the MBTA. Any removal of active nests during the breeding season or any disturbance that results in the abandonment of nestlings is considered a ‘take’ of the species under federal law.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES)

Point source discharge of pollutants into "navigable water" is regulated through the NPDES. All point source discharges must have an NPDES permit (33 U.S.C. 1311). All Corps facilities and activities that meet the definition of an "industrial activity" under 40 CFR 122.26 are subject to the requirement to obtain storm water permits. Ground disturbing activities, such as grading, in excess of 5 acres requires an NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

California Fish and Game Code

The California Fish and Game Code defines “take” (Section 86) and prohibits “taking” of a species listed as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code Section 2080) or otherwise fully protected (as defined in California Fish and Game Code Sections 3511, 4700, and 5050).

The DFG also regulates activities that may impact streambeds or other wetland areas. Division 2, Chapter 6, Section 1601 of the Fish and Game Code states that

"...general plans sufficient to indicate the nature of a project for construction by, or on the behalf of, any governmental agency, state or local, and any public utility, of any project which will divert, obstruct or change the natural flow or bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the department in which there is at any time an existing fish or wildlife resource or from which these resources derive benefit, or will use material from the streambeds designated by the department, shall be submitted to the department."

The DFG has stated that their jurisdiction is any wetland area that is within the 100-year floodplain. Completion of a Section 1601-03 Streambed Alteration Agreement with the DFG is required before any work begins that will affect wetland areas within the 100-year floodplain.
Other Special-Status Species Classifications
California species of special concern (CSC), species on List 1B and List 2 of the California Native Plant Society (Skinner and Pavlik, eds. 1994 updated 2000), and active raptor nests are included in this classification.

City of Sacramento Heritage Tree Ordinance (SCC Title 12, Chapters 12.64.10 – 12.64.70)
Heritage trees are:
1. Any tree of any species with a trunk circumference of 100 inches or more, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.
2. Any native Quercus species, Aesculus californica or Platanus racemosa, having a circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a single trunk, or a cumulative circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a multi-trunk.
3. Any tree thirty-six (36) inches in circumference or greater in a riparian zone. The riparian zone is measured from the centerline of the watercourse to thirty (30) feet beyond the high water line.
4. Any tree, grove of trees or woodland trees designated by resolution of the city council to be of special historical or environmental value or of significant community benefit.

During construction activity on any property upon which is located a heritage tree, the following rules shall apply. Unless the express written permission of the director is first obtained, no person shall:
A. Change the amount of irrigation provided to any heritage tree from that which was provided prior to the commencement of construction activity;
B. Trench, grade or pave into the drip line area of a heritage tree;
C. Change, by more than two feet, grade elevations within thirty (30) feet of the drip line area of a heritage tree;
D. Park or operate any motor vehicle within the drip line area of any heritage tree;
E. Place or store any equipment or construction materials within the drip line area of any heritage tree;
F. Attach any signs, ropes, cables or any other items to any heritage tree;
G. Cut or trim any branch of a heritage tree for temporary construction purposes;
H. Place or allow to flow into or over the drip line area of any heritage tree any oil, fuel, concrete mix or other deleterious substance.

Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan
The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) was prepared to satisfy a mitigation requirement of the 1994 North Natomas Community Plan, which planned to develop North Natomas. The NBHCP is a conservation plan supporting an application for a federal Incidental Take Permit (ITP) permit under Section 10 (a)(1)(B) of FESA and a California State ITP under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code. Developers in the Natomas Basin would participate in the NBHCP for their development activities and be protected by its permits through development agreements, with enforceable conditions of approval, issued by the City of Sacramento. USFWS and DFG approved the NBHCP and issued an ITP to the City of Sacramento in 1997.

The NBHCP and ITP were subsequently challenged on NEPA and CEQA compliance, and on 15 August 2000, the U.S. District Court, Eastern District ruled that the ITP was invalid. Based on this ruling, the City of Sacramento, Sutter County, Reclamation District Number 1000 (RD 1000), and the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company (Natomas Mutual) are jointly preparing a revised Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/ EIS). The City of Sacramento, Sutter County, RD 1000, and Natomas Mutual are preparing and will seek adoption of a revised NBHCP and the issuance of a new ITP by USFWS and DFG for development within the Natomas Basin.
Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal result in impacts to endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The proposed project is not anticipated to adversely affect the species or habitat of the species listed in Table 13 with the implementation of mitigation measures.

Plants

No habitat for special-status plant species occurs within the project study area. No impact is anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Wildlife

Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (Desmocerus californicus dimorphus)

Habitat and Biology: The Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) requires an elderberry shrub (Sambucus mexicana or Sambucus racemosa var. microbotrys) as a host plant. VELB habitat consists of riparian forests whose dominant species include cottonwood, sycamore, Valley oak, and willow, with an understory of elderberry shrubs (USFWS 1991).

Range: Elderberry shrubs that occur in oak woodlands along the margins of rivers and streams from the upper Sacramento Valley to the central San Joaquin Valley (USFWS 1991).

CNDDB/RAREFIND Records: There is one record for VELB on the Taylor Monument quad. The closest VELB record occurs on the Sacramento West quad 1.5 miles south of the project site.

Habitat Present in Study Area? Yes. A total of four blue elderberry shrubs were observed within the project study area. Several stems were greater than one-inch diameter at ground level. No VELB exit holes were observed on any of the stems. GPS data points were taken of the elderberry shrubs and their locations are shown on Figure 11 in Appendix A.

Potential Impact: Blue elderberry shrubs with stems that measure one inch or greater at ground level are considered habitat for VELB and are protected by FESA (USFWS 1999). Several stems are greater than one-inch diameter at ground level. All four of these elderberry shrubs could be removed to construct the proposed project. Removal of these shrubs would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the potential impact to VELB to less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure will reduce potential impacts:

MM 7-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Sacramento shall either, a) include the applicant under the City’s NBHCP Incidental Take Permit (ITP), or b) require the applicant to obtain a project specific ITP from USFWS through Section 10 consultation.

Participation in NBHCP

If the NBHCP ITP is in place, the project applicant would be covered under the City’s ITP by entering into a Developer Agreement with the City of Sacramento, paying the applicable mitigation fees to the Natomas Basin Conservancy, and complying with the requirements of the NBHCP.

Project Specific ITP

If the NBHCP ITP is not in place, the project applicant will obtain a project specific ITP by preparing a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and Biological Assessment (BA) in accordance with current conservation guidelines for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.
Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*)

**HABITAT AND BIOLOGY**: An uncommon breeding resident and migrant in CA. Nests in open riparian habitat, in scattered trees or in small groves in sparsely vegetated flatlands. Nesting areas are usually located near water, but are occasionally found in arid regions. Typical habitat includes open desert, grassland, or cropland containing scattered, large trees or small groves (Zeiner et al. 1990a).

**RANGE**: The summer range of this species in California is the Central Valley. California populations of this species are believed to overwinter in Mexico.

**CNDDB/ RAREFIND RECORDS**: There are 26 records of nesting Swainson’s hawk on the Taylor Monument quad. There are 71 records for nesting Swainson’s hawk within a ten-mile radius of the project study area. There are three records within one mile. Two records representing the closest Swainson’s hawk nests are 0.5 mile from the project study area. One of these records is dated 2000 and is located south of the project within the West Drainage Canal riparian corridor. The other record is to the southwest of the project.

**HABITAT PRESENT IN STUDY AREA?** Yes. The trees occurring near the eastern border of the project study area provide nesting habitat for this species. GPS data points were taken of the trees (Appendix A, Figure 11). The project site provides potential foraging habitat. This species was not observed during the October 2001 field surveys.

**POTENTIAL IMPACT**: Potential nesting and foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk occurs within the project study area. The proposed project would remove the potential nesting trees and would convert approximately 242.6 acres of foraging habitat to urban land use. Conversion of foraging habitat to urban land use would be considered a potentially significant impact. The closest CNDDB/ RareFind record for nesting Swainson’s hawk is 0.25 miles southwest of the project study area. If any active Swainson’s hawk nests occur within 0.25 mile of the project area, and if construction activities that could cause nest abandonment or forced fledging occur during the breeding season (1 March to 15 September), the impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to Swainson’s hawk to less than significant.

**Level of Significance**: Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

**Mitigation Measures**: The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts:

**MM 7-2 Nesting Mitigation**: A preconstruction survey for active Swainson’s hawk nests will be required if construction activities begin within the breeding season (1 March to 15 September). If construction activities begin outside the breeding season, the preconstruction survey for active nests is not required.

If construction is scheduled to commence during the Swainson’s hawk breeding season (1 March to 15 September), the applicant will have a qualified biologist conduct a preconstruction survey to determine if Swainson’s hawks are nesting within 0.25 mile of the project study area. The applicant will provide the City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department with documentation of the results of the survey. If no active nests are found, no mitigation is required.

If active Swainson’s hawk nests are found within 0.25 mile of the project area, DFG will be notified, and no project related activities that would result in nest abandonment (e.g., noise generated from heavy equipment operation) will be conducted during the 1 March to 15 September breeding season without receipt of an exemption from DFG.

**MM 7-3 Foraging Mitigation**: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Sacramento shall either, a) include the applicant under the City’s NBHCP 2081 Management Authorization from DFG, or b) require the applicant to obtain a project specific 2081 Management Authorization for the loss of foraging habitat.

**Participation in NBHCP**

If the NBHCP ITP is in place, the project applicant will be covered under the City’s 2081 Management Authorization by entering into a Developer Agreement with the City of Sacramento, paying the applicable mitigation fees to the Natomas Basin Conservancy, and...
complying with the requirements of the NBHCP.

**Project Specific 2081 Management Authorization**

If the NBHCP ITP is not in place, the project applicant will obtain a project specific 2081 Management Authorization. The authorization will be obtained by providing documentation that the applicable acres of DFG approved Habitat Management (HM) lands and endowment have been acquired.

DFG established the following ratio of HM lands to mitigate for lost acreage of Swainson’s hawk foraging lands for projects within 1 mile of an active nest tree (an “active” nest is defined as one that has been used at least once in the past five years) (DFG 1994):

1) One acre of HM land for each acre of development (1:1 ratio). At least 10% of the HM land shall be met by fee title acquisition or a conservation easement allowing for active management of the habitat, with the remaining 90% protected by a conservation easement on agricultural lands or other lands which provide suitable foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk; or

2) One-half acre of HM land for each acre of development (0.5:1 ratio). All of the HM land shall be met by fee title acquisition or a conservation easement allowing for active management of the habitat for prey production.

3) In addition to acquiring Habitat Management lands, the project applicant shall provide for the long-term management of the HM lands by providing an endowment approved by DFG.

**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

**Western burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia)**

**Habitat and Biology:** This species forages day and night in open dry grassland and desert habitats, and in grass, forb, and open shrub stages of pinyon-juniper and ponderosa pine habitats. Nests in old burrows of ground squirrels or other small mammals. Eats mostly insects; also feeds on small mammals, reptiles, birds, and carrion (Zeiner et al. 1990a). It is a yearlong resident in CA. It breeds from March through August.

**Range:** Central Valley, Sierra Nevada, and coastal ranges (Zeiner et al. 1990a).

**CNDDB/RAREFIND Records:** There is one record for this species on the Taylor Monument quad. This record occurs within the northern portion of the project study area.

**Habitat Present in Study Area?** Yes. Burrow networks of the California ground squirrel along the berms of the east-west running ditches associated with the group of trees offer potential nesting habitat for this species. Burrows are also located in the north-central portion of the project study area. The project site provides potential foraging habitat. No burrowing owls were observed within the project study area.

**Discussion/Potential Impact:** The proposed project would eliminate both the nesting and foraging habitat of this species due to the development of the vacant site to urban land use. Conversion of foraging habitat to urban land use would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to western burrowing owl to less than significant.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

**Mitigation Measures:** The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts:

- **MM 7-4 Nesting Mitigation:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant will have a qualified biologist conduct DFG protocol western burrowing owl nesting surveys and implement follow-up mitigation if necessary. Surveys will be conducted within 30 days prior to construction. The applicant will provide the City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department with documentation of the results of the surveys and any requirements for further mitigation. If no active nests are found, no further nesting mitigation is required.
If western burrowing owl nests are found, the project applicant will implement DFG burrowing owl mitigation guidelines (17 October 1995) as follows:

1) No construction activities that could result in nest abandonment or forced fledging will occur during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31) within 250 feet of active burrows.

2) No construction activities that could result in harassment of burrowing owls will occur during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31) within 160 feet of active burrows.

3) If construction activities within 250 feet of active burrows during the breeding season are necessary, passive relocation techniques will be used to remove western burrowing owls from active burrows under direction from DFG. One-way doors should be installed and left in place for a minimum of 48 hours to insure that owls are not present in the burrow before excavation commences.

4) Two natural or artificial burrows will be provided for each active burrow that will be lost. Participation in the NBHCP would fulfill this requirement. Before excavating burrows the project area will be monitored daily for one week to confirm that owls have not returned. Burrows will be excavated using hand tools to avoid injury to any owl remaining inside burrows.

Foraging Mitigation: The mitigation measures described for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would mitigate for the loss of western burrowing owl foraging habitat.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus)

HABITAT AND BIOLOGY: Forages in short grasslands and plowed fields of the Central Valley during winter. The plover searches the ground for large insects, especially grasshoppers (Zeiner et al. 1990a). This species is not known to nest in California (Zeiner et al. 1990a).

RANGE: Central Valley from Sutter and Yuba cos. southward (Zeiner et al. 1990a).

CNDDB/ RAREFIND RECORDS: There are no records for mountain plover on the Taylor Monument quad.

HABITAT PRESENT IN STUDY AREA? Yes. The project study area is within the known range of the species. The plowed grassland within the project study area provides potential foraging habitat for this species during winter. This species was not observed during the October 2001 field surveys.

POTENTIAL IMPACT: Potential winter foraging habitat for mountain plover occurs within the project study area. The proposed project would eliminate 242.6 acres of foraging habitat for this species due to conversion of the project study area to urban land use. Conversion of foraging habitat to urban land use would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to mountain plover to less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure will reduce potential impacts:

Foraging Mitigation: The mitigation measures described for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would mitigate for the loss of mountain plover foraging habitat.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

Giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas)

HABITAT AND BIOLOGY: Habitat requirements for giant garter snake (GGS) consist of the following: 1) adequate water during the snake's active season (early spring through mid-fall) to provide food and cover, 2) emergent, herbaceous wetland vegetation, such as cattails and bulrushes, for escape cover and foraging habitat during the active season, 3) grassy banks and openings in waterside vegetation for basking, and 4) higher elevation uplands for cover and refuge from flood waters during the snake's winter dormant season (56 FR 67046). Environmental features that provide suitable habitat for GGS include permanent freshwater marshes, agricultural canals, ditches and drains associated with rice fields (Leidy 1992), and streams and sloughs, particularly those with mud bottoms (Stebbins 1985). To avoid inundation in the
winter, GGS overwinter in upland hibernacula, which includes small mammal burrows and debris in close proximity to summer habitat (Leidy 1992). Prey includes small fishes and frogs.

**RANGE:** Floor of the California Central Valley from Delevan National Wildlife Refuge, Colusa Co., to Los Banos Creek and Mud Slough in San Joaquin Co. (Stebbins 1985).

**CNDDB/ RAREFIND RECORDS:** There are 36 records for GGS on the Taylor Monument quad. Six of these records occur within one mile of the project study area. The closest record is 0.3 mile to the northwest of the project study area.

**HABITAT PRESENT IN STUDY AREA?** The California ground squirrel burrow network near the razed homestead could be used by hibernating GGS in winter. However, GGS use of these burrows is unlikely because they are substantially isolated (approximately 1600 feet) from the drainage ditch. No GGS were observed during April/May 2001 GGS protocol surveys (Barry 2001) or October 2001 field visits.

**POTENTIAL IMPACT:** The California ground squirrel burrow network near the razed homestead could be used by hibernating GGS in winter. However, GGS use of these burrows is unlikely because they are substantially isolated (approximately 1600 feet) from the drainage ditch. The project would eliminate the burrow network. If GGS use these burrows as hibernacula, removal of the burrows would be considered a significant effect. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to GGS to less than significant.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

**Mitigation Measures:** The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts:

**MM 7-5** The project applicant will take the following measures to minimize the potential for “take” of GGS:

1) Construction within 75 feet of the burrow network will occur only between 1 May and 30 September.
2) A survey will be conducted 24 hours prior to construction to determine if GGS is present in the burrow network.
3) A qualified biologist will monitor construction activities within 75 feet of the burrow network to ensure that GGS are not affected.

**MM 7-6** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Sacramento shall either, a) include the applicant under the City’s NBHCP ITP, or b) require the applicant to obtain a project specific ITP from USFWS through Section 10 consultation.

**Participation in NBHCP**

If the NBHCP ITP is in place, the project applicant would be covered under the City’s ITP by entering into a Developer Agreement with the City of Sacramento, paying the applicable mitigation fees to the Natomas Basin Conservancy, and complying with the requirements of the NBHCP.

**Project Specific ITP**

If the NBHCP ITP is not in place, the project applicant will obtain a project specific ITP by preparing a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and Biological Assessment (BA) in accordance with current conservation guidelines for the giant garter snake.

**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

**b) Would the proposal result in impacts to locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** One heritage tree occurs within the project study area (Appendix A, Figure 11). The City of Sacramento protects heritage trees by ordinance (SCC 12.64.10 – 12.64.70). The ordinance was amended on 14 June 1994 to further define and protect heritage trees. Heritage trees are defined as trees of any species having a trunk circumference of 100 inches or greater, or about 32 inches in diameter,
measured 4.5 feet above ground level.

In addition to the requirements of SCC 12.64.10 – 12.64.70 described above, the City Arborist specified further mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to City heritage trees to less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are required by the City Arborist:

MM 7-7 The construction contractor will take the following precautions:
1) Prior to construction, the contractor will establish a six-foot high chain link fence around the drip line of the heritage oak.
2) No grade changes or trenching will occur within the fenced area.
3) Landscaping under the drip line should be compatible with native oaks.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

c) Would the proposal result in impacts to locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?

Answer: No. Sensitive natural communities are rare communities recognized by the Natural Diversity Data Base, and includes communities that are adversely affected by minimal disturbance, and select communities that provide habitat for special-status plant or wildlife species. There are no sensitive communities in the project study area.

d) Would the proposal result in impacts to wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?

Answer: No. No wetlands or other waters of the U.S. were reported in the project study area. The Corps verified the delineation (Gibson and Skordal 1999) and determined that no permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be required for the proposed project (Corps Regulatory No. 199900679).

e) Would the proposal result in impacts to wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The drainage ditch along San Juan Road provides dispersal habitat for GGS. This ditch is approximately six feet wide and three feet deep. This ditch contains slowly flowing water part of the year, but was dry during October 2001 field visits. A narrow band of hydrophytic vegetation was present in the ditch during the 1999 jurisdictional delineation. Common hydrophytes within the ditch included tall flatsedge (Cyperus eragrostis), narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia), and dallis grass (Paspalum dilatatum) (Gibson and Skordal 1999). The drainage ditch partially fulfills the hydrological and some cover requirements of this species. The absence of perennial water in the drainage ditch precludes a dependable forage source that is necessary to be considered suitable foraging habitat for the species. Giant garter snake may occur as a potential transient in this drainage.

Grading and construction activities could affect GGS in this drainage ditch by degrading dispersal habitat and/or injuring GGS if they are present at the time of construction. Activities that alter the drainage ditch or injure GGS would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with mitigation implementation.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts:

MM 7-8 The project applicant will take the following measures to minimize the potential for “take” of GGS:
1) Construction within 75 feet of the southern drainage will occur only between 1 May and 30 September.
2) A survey will be conducted 24 hours prior to construction to determine if GGS is present in the southern drainage.
3) A qualified biologist will monitor construction activities within 75 feet of the southern drainage canal to ensure that GGS are not affected.
4) If the banks of the southern drainage canal are affected, the banks will be revegetated with native grass species. The type of seed that will be used will be commercially available native grass species (e.g., Bromus carinatus, Elymus glaucus, and/or Poa secunda).

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.
8. Hazards

Would the proposal involve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on hazards and hazardous materials is based on the following factors:

- Potential hazards and/or hazardous materials encountered during any subsurface excavation;
- Proper disposal of hazardous materials encountered during trenching or any subsurface excavation; and
- Potential discharge of hazardous materials or waste during operation of the proposed land uses.

Impact Mechanisms

Potential impacts associated with the proposed project could include:

- Potential exposure to existing contaminated soils, contaminated groundwater, abandoned underground storage tanks and piping and contaminated material from existing undocumented dumping and landfiling;
- Potential exposure to, and releases of, hazardous materials such as oils, grease, lubricants, and solvents used during normal construction operations;
- Potential risk of upset to the public or the environment as a result of an unanticipated impact involving an underground object; and
- Potential exposure to, and releases of, hazardous materials such as oils, grease, lubricants, and solvents used during normal operations of the proposed land uses.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located in the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento (Taylor Monument quad, T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road. The El Centro Drain and Detention Basin borders the project area on the west, south of South Loop Road. North of South Loop Road, the Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north. The entire project site and bordering properties are planned for residential and mixed-use development by the SGPU and the NNCP.

Wallace – Kuhl and Associates Inc. (Wallace – Kuhl) conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the proposed project and prepared an “Environmental Site Assessment for Pacific Central Properties II, Vicinity of San Juan Road and Interstate 5, Sacramento, California” in 1998. The report was prepared in accordance with the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E 1527-97 for Environmental Assessments. The scope of the Site Assessment included (Wallace – Kuhl, 1 – 2):
- A field reconnaissance of the property to look for visual evidence of surface and potential subsurface sources of contamination;
- A "windshield survey" in the vicinity of the property to identify businesses that may use or produce hazardous materials;
- A review of Sacramento County Assessor's office records to establish current property ownership;
- Interviews with representatives of various regulatory agencies and those familiar with the site history of the property, including discussion of past operational practices as well as review of a previous asbestos survey of the property;
- Examination of stereoscopic aerial photographs of the property taken over the last 37 years, as well as review of historic USGS topographic maps, archived building records and/or Sanborn Map coverage of the property, in order to develop a reasonably continuous site history over the past 50 years, as required by the ASTM standard;
- Review of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of Sacramento, California for soils information and historic crop cultivation trends for the subject property and vicinity, as well as inquiry with the Sacramento County Agricultural Commissioner's Office;
- An evaluation of local and regional ground water conditions, including historical depths and flow direction;
- A discussion of proposed municipal infrastructure for the property and vicinity, including potable water, wastewater, and stormwater provisions, as required by the ASTM standard;
- A review of federal, state, and county regulatory agency lists indicating any known instances of hazardous materials contamination and registered underground and aboveground storage tanks (USTs/ASTs) on or near the property; and
- A literature-based discussion of the likelihood for radon to be problematic at the property.

Laboratory testing of the existing soils and ground water for hazardous materials was not conducted. Surveys for asbestos and lead-based paint were not necessary because historic buildings had been razed and demolition materials had been removed from the property (Wallace—Kuhl, 3).

The Wallace — Kuhl Site Assessment concluded that there is no evidence of significant hazardous materials contamination on or within one-half mile of the property (Wallace — Kuhl, 22). Three irrigation water supply wells are located on the property. Wallace — Kuhl recommends that if the wells will not be used in the future, they be properly destroyed (Wallace — Kuhl, 23). Proper well abandonment requires obtaining a destruction permit (issued on a per-well basis) from the Sacramento County Environmental Health Division. Wallace — Kuhl also noted the possibility of an unidentified septic system occurring on site (Wallace — Kuhl, 23). If previously unidentified septic systems are encountered, each would be abandoned with the guide earthwork specifications typically contained in qualified geotechnical reports (Wallace — Kuhl, 23).

Concerning persistent residual organochlorine pesticide concentrations (DDT for example), Wallace — Kuhl did not conduct soil samples of the property site. However, soils sampling and testing programs completed by Wallace — Kuhl at California Central Valley agricultural sites, including hundreds of acres in north and south Natomas, have revealed low to non-detectable concentrations of DDT compounds in surficial soils that rarely exceeded health-based criteria for unrestricted future development or the "hazardous waste" criteria for soils disposal contained in Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Article 3, Section 66261.24 (Wallace — Kuhl, 23). With respect specifically to previous Natomas work, none (emphasis Wallace — Kuhl's) of the results of soils sampling and testing programs have exceeded either health-based or hazardous waste criteria for unrestricted future development (Wallace — Kuhl, 23). Wallace — Kuhl concludes on page 24, "Therefore, based on the results of this assessment, the fact that the subject property has a crop history in common with previously studied Natomas sites, and considering that the outcome of our previous Natomas soils sampling and testing for potential persistent pesticide residuals have revealed very low to non-detectable concentrations of those analytes, in our professional opinion no further assessment of the property is necessary in regard to potential persistent pesticide residuals."

Wallace — Kuhl identified two agency-listed facilities, the Natomas Airport and Elixer Industries, both east of Interstate 5, that are known to have experienced subsurface contamination as a result of UST leakage or other sources and neither site has undergone remediation (Wallace — Kuhl, 24). The regional predicted ground water flow direction is easterly, meaning that the property is upgradient from the agency-listed contaminated sites.
No known regional hazardous material impairment to groundwater quality in the area of the property was identified (Wallace – Kuhl, 25). Wallace – Kuhl determined that the Phase I Site Assessment revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the property (Wallace – Kuhl, 25).

Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) enforces federal regulations pertaining to hazardous substances and wastes. The hazardous substances and waste laws are contained in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Recovery Act of 1980 (CERCLA). These laws require responsible parties to report any known hazardous waste contamination to the U.S. EPA. The U.S. EPA maintains standards for requiring the responsible parties to clean up the hazardous substances to minimize threat to the public health. Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Section 372 (40 CFR 372) contains specific guidelines for determining whether a waste is hazardous and the acceptable levels of residual contaminants. The U.S. EPA delegated regulatory authority to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) within the California Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA).

The Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Fed/OSHA) enforces federal regulations assuring worker safety in the handling and use of chemicals. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 mandates Fed/OSHA to provide rules that protect worker safety. 29 CFR 1910 contains specific standards for handling hazardous materials in the workplace. The Fed/OSHA delegated regulatory authority to the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA).

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES)
Point source discharge of pollutants into "navigable water" is regulated through the NPDES. All point source discharges must have an NPDES permit (33 U.S.C. 1311). Ground disturbing activities, such as grading, in excess of 5 acres requires an NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is a requirement of the NPDES permit. Hazardous material spill prevention and spill cleanup Best management practices (BMPs), set-forth by the California Stormwater Task Force, March 1993, are included in the SWPPP. Adherence to the SWPPP reduces the potential for accidental discharge of hazardous materials to a level of less than significant.

State Regulations
The California Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL) contains definitions of hazardous substances and wastes and requires responsible parties to report of their occurrence. Hazardous materials must be reported to DTSC, RWQCB, and/or the City of Sacramento Public Health Department. The HWCL lists 791 hazardous substances and approximately 30 common materials that are potentially hazardous. It establishes criteria for managing these substances including labeling, treatment, permit requirements, and disposal restrictions. The California Hazardous Substances Account Act (CHSAA) provides standards for requiring the responsible parties to clean up the hazardous substances and allows for public funds to clean up hazards where private funds are not available.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) enforces regulations for the removal of existing septic tanks. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, Article 7 § 2672 defines how septic tanks are to be removed in order to protect water quality. Owners or operators of underground storage tanks subject to permanent closure shall comply with applicable provisions of Chapter 6.5 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code.

Cal/OSHA regulations concerning the use of hazardous materials in the workplace, as detailed in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) include requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, accident prevention programs, hazardous substances exposure warnings, and emergency action and fire prevention plan. Properties found to be contaminated with a hazardous substance are subject to special worker safety requirements to protect construction workers during demolition and excavation.

City of Sacramento General Plan
The following Overall Goal in the SGPU Health and Safety Element directs City planning decisions and is
applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-62):

**Goal A:** Protect the public from detrimental sources that are within the City’s responsibility to regulate.

**Hazardous Materials**

The following goals and policies in the SGPU Health and Safety Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-64):

**Goal A:** Rid the Sacramento area of uncontrolled toxic wastes.

**Policy 1:** Work with the county, state, and federal agencies and responsible parties to identify, contain, and clean up the toxic waste site.

**Policy 2:** Work with other government agencies to identify past and present toxic waste generators.

**Sacramento City Code**

SCC Title 8.60 Hazardous Material Cleanup and 8.64 Hazardous Materials Disclosure provide guidelines that ensure that hazardous materials are handled safely, thus reducing the risk of exposure to the public.

SCC Title 15.36 Fire Code provides standards and specifications for the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from fire or explosion. This code ensures that projects are planned to provide adequate safety for building occupants and to maximize the ability of the fire department to respond to emergencies.

SCC Title 15.80 Personal Safety Code All projects shall be reviewed to determine the levels of public and personal safety provided.

**Impact Assessment**

**a) Would the proposal involve a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?**

**Answer:** Potential Impact. Construction of the proposed project could result in the accidental spill of hazardous materials, such as fuel. Grading and/or excavation activities could unearth previously unidentified hazardous material(s). Operation of the residential and employment centers land uses could result in an accidental spill of hazardous materials or waste.

**Potential Impact:** Construction will involve gas and diesel powered equipment. The project would also include asphalt paving. Roadways will be delineated by reflective paint. Fuel, cleaning solvents, paint, oil, or other hazardous materials could be accidentally spilled in the process of construction. Such a spill could put construction employees at risk of exposure to the hazardous materials.

The SCC and the NDPES permit program regulate the proposed project. The following standard practices provided in SCC would be incorporated into construction plans to protect construction workers and the public from significant hazards:

- The construction contractor will ensure proper labeling, storage, handling, and use of hazardous materials in accordance with best management practices and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s HAZWOPER requirements;
- The construction contractor will ensure that employees are properly trained in the use and handling of these materials and that each material is accompanied by a material safety data sheet;
- All reserve fuel supplies and hazardous materials will be stored on pallets within fenced and secured construction areas and protected from exposure to weather. Incompatible materials will be stored separately, as appropriate;
- Equipment refueling and maintenance will take place only within staging areas.

**Level of Significance:** Adherence to SCC 8.60 and 8.64 and to the conditions of the NPDES permit will
reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project will require grading and excavation activities for site preparation and construction of roadways and utilities infrastructure. Grading and excavation activities could unearth previously unidentified hazardous material(s) or contaminated soils.

The proposed project is subject to the SCC. SCC Title 8.60 Hazardous Material Cleanup indicates that if a hazardous material is encountered the Sacramento Fire Department is to be notified. The project plans will indicate that if a hazardous material is unearthed, then work in the immediate area will cease and the fire department will be notified.

**Level of Significance:** Adherence to SCC Title 8.60 reduces the potential impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**Potential Impact:** The project, as proposed, does not plan to store or use toxic or flammable materials on the project site during the operation phase. Storage of toxics or chemicals in large quantities is not an activity normally associated with residential and office development. However, the EC − 50 designation permits 10% of the acreage to be developed as retail and another 20% of the acreage to be developed as light industrial uses. It is possible that a light industrial use could involve the use of toxic chemicals. An accidental spill of these materials, in greater or lesser quantities, could expose employees to significant health risks. If a large quantity should be accidentally spilled, the hazardous material could leach into the soil and/or ground water. This could result exposing the public to significant health risks.

Should toxic or flammable materials be used on the site, the project would be regulated by 29 CFR 1910 Fed/OSHA and SCC Title 8.64 Hazardous Materials Disclosure guidelines. SCC Title 8.64 requires that a disclosure statement is filed with the Sacramento Fire Department that includes a list of all the potentially hazardous materials, the maximum amounts anticipated to be used, and how and where the materials would be stored.

**Level of Significance:** Adherence to 40 CFR 372, 29 CFR 1910, and the SCC reduces the potential impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

b) Would the proposal involve possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Answer:** No.

c) Would the proposal involve the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?

**Answer:** No.

d) Would the proposal involve exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** The NNCP EIR identified the proliferation of mosquitoes as an impact of developing the North Natomas area. The EIR found that as rice fields are converted to urban uses mosquitoes would thrive in profusion. To reduce the negative impact and to protect urban residents from mosquitoes, the EIR identified the following mitigation measure:

The Sacramento Yolo Mosquito Abatement District should implement a specific mosquito abatement program in order to provide urban standards of mosquito control in the project area. Additional...
revenues for the District would be necessary to pay for the increased control costs (NNCP EIR, B-37).

The NNCP identified the preparation of a mosquito abatement plan as a Community-Wide Design Standard under the Environmental Design Standards (NNCP, 83). If the Sacramento Yolo Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District implements a mosquito abatement plan and an assessment district is delineated to defray the cost of the plan’s implementation, the proposed project would be required to participate.

**Level of Significance:** Participation in the Mosquito Abatement Control Program Assessment District to be established by the Sacramento Yolo Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District reduces the potential impact from mosquito profusion to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

e) **Would the proposal involve increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?**

**Answer:** No.
9. Noise

Would the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increases in existing noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

Title 24 of the California Government Code, the City of Sacramento Health and Safety Element, and the City Noise Ordinance establish the thresholds of significance.

Title 24 of the California Government Code establishes the Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for development. For residential land uses an exterior Day/Night Noise Level (L_{dn}) or Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of less than or equal to 60 decibels (dB) is considered acceptable; an L_{dn} or CNEL between 60 and 70 dB is considered conditionally acceptable (new construction should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design); an L_{dn} or CNEL between 70 and 75 dB is considered normally unacceptable (new development should be discouraged); and an L_{dn} or CNEL of 76 dB or greater is clearly unacceptable. The SGPU Health and Safety Element, under the subheading Noise, establishes that where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB L_{dn} or less using practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level up to 65 dB L_{dn} may be allowed. The SGPU also establishes an interior noise level criterion of 45 dB L_{dir}.

For office building land uses an exterior L_{dn} or CNEL of less than or equal to 65 dB is considered acceptable; an L_{dn} or CNEL between 65 and 80 dB is considered conditionally acceptable (new construction should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design); an L_{dn} or CNEL of 80 dB and greater is considered normally unacceptable (new development should be discouraged).

For industrial, manufacturing, utilities, and agricultural land uses an L_{dn} or CNEL of less than or equal to 75 dB is considered acceptable; an L_{dn} or CNEL between 70 and 80 dB is considered conditionally acceptable (new construction should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design); and an L_{dn} or CNEL between 75 and 90 dB is considered normally unacceptable (new development should be discouraged).

SGPU states that an increase of 3 dB or less is considered less than significant. Increases of 4 or 5 dB is considered a significant adverse impact if the total resulting noise would exceed that considered normally acceptable (60 dB for residential). Increases of 6 or more dB are considered a significant adverse impact due to the potential for adverse community response (SGPU, AA-48).

Impact Mechanisms

Noise impacts could occur to the proposed land uses from off-site sources, such as traffic and airport noise. Construction equipment could cause noise impacts to surrounding land uses. The project could generate noise...
that could impact surrounding land uses.

**Environmental Setting**

The proposed project is located in the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento (Taylor Monument quad, T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project site is currently vacant. The entire project site and bordering properties are planned for residential and mixed-use development by the SGPU and the NNCP.

Bollard and Brennan, Inc. (Bollard and Brennan) prepared an “Environmental Noise Analysis for Alleghany Properties, Inc., City of Sacramento, North Natomas” in August 2001 (B & B 2001a) and a “Revised Environmental Noise Analysis for Alleghany Properties, Inc., City of Sacramento, North Natomas” in October 2001 (B & B 2001b). The purpose of these analyses was to determine potential noise impacts to the proposed single-family residential areas from Interstate 5 (I-5), proposed office/commercial, and day care facility.

Bollard and Brennan calculated existing traffic noise levels from I-5 in the project vicinity using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Noise prediction model (FHWA-RD-77-108). The FHWA Model predicts hourly Leq values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is considered accurate within ± 1.5 dB. Bollard and Brennan used the Calveno traffic noise emission curves to more accurately predict noise levels. Bollard and Brennan conducted noise level measurements at four locations on the project site and concurrent counts of I-5 traffic to test the accuracy of the FHWA model. The FHWA model was found to over-predict the traffic noise levels on three of the four test sites. The FHWA model slightly under-predicted (-1.9 dB) the fourth site. Future noise levels were then adjusted by —3 dB (B & B 2001a, 2).

Bollard and Brennan conducted a continuous 24-hour noise level measurement on the project site. The 24-hour noise level measurements were conducted to determine the effective day/night traffic split and temporal distribution of traffic noise over a 24-hour period. To determine the future traffic noise levels on the project site, Bollard and Brennan used the predicted future traffic data that was used for the Arena Boulevard Overcrossing project (Bollard and Brennan (B & B 2001a, 2—4).

Based upon the predicted future traffic noise levels, Bollard and Brennan found that locations of the proposed residential uses would be exposed to traffic noise levels in excess of the SGPU exterior noise levels. Table 14 shows the distance to Ldn contours from the centerline of Interstate 5. Table 14 also shows the predicted Ldn at the nearest residential development. The analysis of traffic noise levels shown in Table 14 do not account for potential shielding from future office/commercial uses between I-5 and the planned residences (B & B 2001b, 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Ldn Contours (feet)</th>
<th>Predicted Ldn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 dB at nearest south single-family residences</td>
<td>At medium density residential to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 dB at nearest north single-family residences</td>
<td>At medium density residential to the north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,468 feet</td>
<td>67 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,146 feet</td>
<td>68 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 dB</td>
<td>69 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Predicted noise levels are based upon distances from the Interstate 5 centerline.

The office/commercial buildings are expected to be a minimum of two-stories in height, and are expected to provide some shielding of traffic noise levels. Bollard and Brennan determined the potential shielding effects from the commercial uses by incorporating the FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model technical reference manual shield adjustments. The FHWA manual states that a 3dBA shielding is provided by a first row of buildings, when the buildings occupy 40 to 65 percent of the length of the view of the roadway. Because the office/commercial development would shield approximately 40% of the view of the roadway, Bollard and Brennan included a -3 dBA correction in the analysis (B & B 2001b, 5). Table 15 shows the corrected predicted future noise levels. The location of the noise contours shown on Table 15 does not change for second floor receivers (B & B 2001b, 5).
Table 15. Predicted Future Interstate 5 Noise Levels at Ground Level First Floor with -3 dBA Shielding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Ldn Contours (feet)</th>
<th>Predicted Ldn</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 dB</td>
<td>At nearest south single-family residences</td>
<td>At medium density residential to the south</td>
<td>At nearest north single-family residences</td>
<td>At medium density residential to the north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>64 dB</td>
<td>65 dB</td>
<td>66 dB</td>
<td>66 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1,146                           | Note: Predicted noise levels are based upon distances from the Interstate 5 centerline.

The project site is not within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour of the Sacramento International Airport as shown in Exhibit 4.6-3 of the 1994 NNCP SEIR. Based upon the distances to the predicted light rail Ldn contours shown in Table 4.6-6 of the 1994 NNCP SEIR, the project site would not be significantly effected by noise generated from light rail. According to Exhibit 4.6-5 of the 1994 NNCP SEIR, the project site occurs outside of the 65 dB for the PA system and outside of the 55 dB for outdoor concerts at Arco Arena.

Regulatory Setting

California Government Code
Title 24 of the California Government Code establishes the Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for low-density single family residential land uses as:

- an exterior Ldn or CNEL of less than or equal to 60 dB is considered “acceptable;”
- an Ldn or CNEL between 60 and 70 dB is considered “conditionally acceptable” (new construction should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design);
- an Ldn or CNEL between 70 and 75 dB is considered “normally unacceptable” (new development should be discouraged); and
- an Ldn or CNEL of 76 dB or greater is “clearly unacceptable.”

City of Sacramento General Plan
The following Goal in the SGPU Health and Safety Element directs City planning decisions and is applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-62):

Goal A: Protect the public from detrimental sources that are within the City’s responsibility to regulate.

Noise
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Health and Safety Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-65):

Goal A: Future development should be compatible with the projected year 2016 noise environment.

Policy 1: Require an acoustical report for any project, which would be exposed to noise levels in excess of those shown as normally acceptable. The contents of the acoustical report shall be as described in Section IV. No acoustical report shall be required where City staff has an existing acoustical report on file, which is acceptable.

Policy 2: Require mitigation measures to reduce noise exposure to “Normally Acceptable Levels” except where such measures are not feasible.

Policy 3: Land uses proposed where the exterior noise level would be below the “normally acceptable” limit may be approved without any requirement for interior or exterior mitigation measures.

North Natomas Community Plan
The following Environmental Design Standards direct City planning decisions in the North Natomas...
Community (NNCP, 85):

**Acoustical Study:** A detailed acoustical study shall be required for any land use which potentially would be incompatible with outdoor noise limits specified by requirements of the Noise Element of the General Plan, or which is located within the Noise Impact Areas shown in the NNCP EIR.

**Mitigate Surface Transportation Noise:** 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 $L_{dn}$ of 45 dB. Indoor noise levels shall not exceed an $L_{dn}$ of 45 dB.

**Sacramento City Code - Noise Ordinance**
SCC Title 8.68 Noise Control provides regulations controlling noise from sources other than traffic. SCC Title 8.68.080 provides an exemption for construction related noise sources. Construction may occur between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Sunday. Internal combustion engines must be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers in good working order.

**Impact Assessment**

*a) Would the proposal result in increases in existing noise levels?*

**Answer:** Potential Impact. The proposed project will contribute short-term and long-term noise to the existing Community Noise Environment.

**Potential Impact:** Construction will generate noise greater than the current ambient noise levels. Construction noise will be temporary and is regulated by SCC Title 8.68 Noise Control. The ordinance provides regulations controlling noise from sources other than traffic. Construction related noise sources would be permitted Monday – Saturday 7 a.m. – 6 p.m. and Sunday 9 a.m. – 6 p.m. Table 16 shows the noise standards that apply during the construction phase of the project. Internal combustion engines will be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers in good working order.

**Table 16. Construction Related Noise Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Duration of the Intrusive Sound</th>
<th>Allowable Decibels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative period of 30 minutes per hour</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative period of 15 minutes per hour</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative period of 5 minutes per hour</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative period of 1 minute per hour</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level not to be exceeded for any time per hour</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Significance:** Adherence to the City noise ordinance reduces potential impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project including the residential development and the employment center development will increase traffic in the vicinity, which would contribute noise to the existing Community Noise Environment. Under year 2016 conditions, the $L_{dn}$ from 75 feet of the centerline of San Juan Road is expected to increase 2 dB from El Centro Road to Interstate 5 (SGPU, AA-19). This would be considered a less than significant increase. The $L_{dn}$ from 75 feet of the centerline of the proposed South Loop Road is predicted to be 70 dB from El Centro Road to East Commerce Way (AA-20). This increase exceeds the 60 dB $L_{dn}$ standard for residential uses. However, the project’s contribution would be proportional with other development in the vicinity. On its own, the proposed project is not expected to generate greater than 3 dB $L_{dn}$. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution of noise to the Community Noise Environment would be considered less than significant.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.
Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the proposal result in exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Answer: Potential impact. The proposed project would not result in exposure of people to severe noise levels in the short term. However, the project could potentially expose people to severe noise levels in the long term. The Environmental Noise Analysis prepared by Bollard and Brennan identified two sources of potential noise impacts to the proposed residential dwelling units: 1) I-5 traffic noise and 2) Office/commercial noise impacts.

Potential Impact: Tables 14 and 15 and Figure 10 in Appendix A shows the locations proposed dwelling units within the 65 dB Ldn noise contour. Locating residential development within an Ldn or CNEL above 60 dB is considered conditionally acceptable in the SGPU.

This noise impact can be avoided through project design. Placing barriers such as walls, berms, or other structures between a noise source and a receiver can shield the receiver from noise impacts. Bollard and Brennan used the FHWA noise barrier performance analysis methodology to determine the insertion loss and resulting noise level provided by different barrier heights at the first rows of lots affected by I-5 noise (B & B 2001b, 7). Table 17 shows the results of the barrier analysis and Figure 10 in Appendix A shows the barrier locations and barrier heights. The barrier heights and locations account for the 3 dBA discount from the office/commercial development. Barriers can be constructed of concrete block, precast concrete, or earthen berms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. Results of Barrier Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Single Family Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Single Family Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Noise reduction from barriers is only at first floor receivers.

Level of Impact: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 9-1 The project applicant shall provide for the implementation of noise walls as indicated in “Revised Environmental Noise Analysis for Alleghany Properties, Inc., City of Sacramento, North Natomas” (Bollard and Brennan 2001).

North Single Family Residential Development
a. East facing property lines – 8-foot high berm-wall.
b. North facing property lines of the four nearest lots to I-5 – 6-foot high wall.
c. South facing property lines of the eight nearest lots to I-5 – 6-foot high wall.
d. Remaining lots facing I-5 – 6-foot high wall.

South Single Family Residential Development
e. East facing property lines – 8-foot high berm-wall.
f. North facing property lines of the two nearest lots to I-5 – 6-foot high wall.
g. South facing property lines of the three nearest lots to 1-5 – 6-foot high wall.

h. Remaining lots facing 1-5 – 6-foot high wall.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Potential Impact: The office/commercial uses could cause noise impacts to the neighboring residential housing development. The noise sources associated with the office/commercial uses are usually delivery trucks and garbage collection trucks. Bollard and Brennan estimated that the maximum noise levels from on-site delivery at 74 dB at the nearest residence (B & B 2001b, 6). Truck deliveries between 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. could exceed the nighttime noise criterion of 70 dB L_{max}.

Level of Impact: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of MM 9-1 will satisfy mitigation for noise generated by sources within the office/commercial development.

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Potential Impact: Two story residential uses within the 65 dB L_{dn} contour could be susceptible to interior noise levels in excess of the City standard of 45 dB L_{dn}.

Typical façade design and construction in accordance with prevailing industry practices would result in an exterior traffic noise attenuation of 20 to 25 dB L_{dn} with windows closed (B & B 2001b, 10). Noise attenuation of 12 to 15 dB L_{dn} would be expected with windows partially open (B & B 2001b, 10). Second floor facades generally experience traffic noise levels between 3 and 5 dB L_{dn} higher than first floor facades (B & B 2001b, 10). Improvements to the residential building facades would be required to comply with the City’s interior noise level standard of 45 dB L_{dn}.

Level of Impact: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 9-2 Prior to issuing a Special Permit for any residential development within the 65 dB L_{dn} noise contour, as it is show in “Revised Environmental Noise Analysis for Alleghany Properties, Inc., City of Sacramento, North Natomas” (Bollard and Brennan 2001), the City of Sacramento will verify that

a) First-floor bedroom windows within the 65 dB L_{dn} noise contour have a minimum sound transmission class rating of 30; and

b) First-floor building facades of those residences located within the 65 dB L_{dn} noise contour will be constructed of stucco or wood siding with an under-layer of 5/8 inch particle board.

MM 9-3 The City of Sacramento will not approve any Special Permit to construct any two-story residences within the 65 dB L_{dn} noise contour, as it is shown in Figure 10 in Appendix A (Bollard and Brennan 2001).

Level of Impact After Mitigation: Less than significant.
10. Public Services

Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in any of the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other governmental services?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on public services is based on question 10. a-e in the environmental checklist.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located in the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento (Taylor Monument quad, T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project site is currently vacant. The entire project site and bordering properties are planned for residential and mixed-use development by the SGPU and the NNCP.

Fire Protection Service

The Sacramento Fire Department Engine Company 15 serves the project study area (SGPU, M-3). Engine Company 15 is comprised of 4 personnel. The nearest Hazardous Material Unit is located on Challenge Way, off of Exposition Boulevard (SGPU, M-2). The service radius for Engine Company 15 is 2 miles and its average response time is 4 minutes (SGPU, M-1). Proposed SGPU development would significantly increase the demand for fire protection services and facilities, particularly in areas projected to experience the largest share of growth. Development in North Natomas would require the following (SGPU, M-4):

- Relocation of Station 3 to the Metro Airport entrance;
- Construction of a new fire station at Del Paso Road and El Centro Road with an engine/truck company and a Hazardous Materials Unit;
- Construction of a second new fire station at Elkhorn Boulevard and Ernst Road with an engine company.

Police Protection Services

The Sacramento City Police Department serves the project study area. The average response time to first priority calls is 7.5 – 8 minutes. Response times for priority two and three calls averages between 12 minutes and can take as long as 35 minutes (SGPU, L-1). SGPU found that the planned residential, office, commercial, and industrial land uses would create a demand for additional police protection. The most significant impacts would occur in areas such as North Natomas where intensive development, high technology uses, substantial residential and nonresidential interface, a higher potential for circulation problems, and extensive use of greenbelts could require redistricting of City patrol districts and creation of a new patrol area to provide adequate protection (SGPU, L-3). Police Department recommended standards for officers per capita is two per 1,000 residents (SGPU, L-5). The proposed project would not be considered a special generator (land uses requiring additional security).
Schools
The Natomas Union Elementary School District (Natomas SD) provides elementary and middle schools for grades K–6 for the project study area (SGPU, P-6). Grant Joint Union High School District (Grant Joint Union SD) provides middle and high schools for grades 7–12 for the project study area (SGPU, P-6). The Natomas SD is comprised of one K–6 school within City limits and one 7–8 school (SGPU, P-10). Due to enrollment in excess of capacity, the district has been declared "impacted" since 1984 (SGPU, P-10). Grant Union Joint SD provides middle schools for the Del Paso Heights Elementary School District, the Rio Linda Elementary School District, and the North Sacramento Elementary School District (SGPU, P-10). Grant Union Joint SD provides high schools for the above listed school districts as well as the Natomas SD (SGPU, P-10). Excess capacity exists for the Grant Union Joint SD with the highest percentage of capacity in the middle schools (SGPU, P-10).

The Natomas SD is projected to increase 594%. Project K–6 enrollment would require six schools. The NNCP designates nine sites (in excess of three sites). The three elementary school sites could be relocated to the Rio Linda Elementary School District (SGPU, P-22 – P-23). Projected grades 7–8 enrollment would require one middle school. The NNCP designates three sites (in excess of two sites). One of the middle school sites could be relocated to accommodate Grant Joint Union SD middle school needs (SGPU, P-22).

Regulatory Setting

City of Sacramento General Plan
The following Overall Goals in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-56):

Goal A: Provide a high quality of public facilities and services to all areas of the City.

Goal B: Time all new public facilities and services as closely as possible to approved City expansion.

Goal D: Achieve economy and efficiency in the provision of services and facilities.

Goal E: Design public facilities in such a manner as to ensure safety and attractiveness.

Fire Services
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-60):

Goal A: Provide adequate fire service to all areas of the City.

Policy 2: Ensure that adequate water supplies are available for fire-fighting equipment in newly developing areas.

Policy 4: Promote greater coordination of land use development proposal with the Fire Department to ensure adequate on-site fire protection.

Policy 5: Promote greater use of fire sprinkler systems for both residential and commercial uses.

The following goals and policies in the SGPU Health and Safety Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-64):

Goal A: Maintain effective programs for fire protection and prevention.

Policy 1: Continue the Fire Department's program for inspecting all public and private buildings and review all future development to ensure maximum safety from potential fire hazards.

Policy 2: Require existing and proposed buildings to have adequate fire protection measures to reduce the potential loss of lives and properties.
Police Services
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-60):

Goal A: Provide the highest level of police service to protect City residents and businesses.

Policy 1: Continue Police Department participation in the review of subdivision proposals and in assisting the Public Works Department with traffic matters.

Schools:
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-59):

Goal A: Continue to assist school districts in providing quality education facilities that will accommodate projected student enrollment growth.

The Natomas SD standards require that elementary schools be a minimum of 10 acres and planned for 600 students and middle schools be a minimum of 20 acres and planned for 900 students (SGPU, P-10). The Grant Union Joint SD recommends middle schools to be 23-25 acres and have an average loading of 750 students and senior high schools to be 40 acres and have an average loading of 1,500 students (SGPU, P-9).

North Natomas Community Plan
The following Guiding Policies direct City planning decisions in the North Natomas Community (NNCP, 65):

A. Provide excellent fire and police protection to the residents, workers, and visitors to the North Natomas Community.

B. Design the physical form of the community to require less police protection.

C. Promote community services and programs to decrease the need for police protection.

D. Provide civic uses to meet the cultural, entertainment, and informational needs of the residents, workers, and visitors to the North Natomas Community.

E. Provide medical and other health facilities to enhance the quality of life in the community.

F. Maximize revenue generating potential of City owned land and facilities balanced with meeting other public interest goals.

Fire Protection Services
Prior to development, the City Fire Department must verify that adequate fire protection services, including equipment and personnel, exists to serve the project, or will be provided, to achieve and maintain a fire insurance rating of 2.0, either through a funded program or as a condition of approval for the project.

The Financing Approach outlined in the NNCP defines the public and private responsibilities to provide community facilities (NNCP, 90). The Private sector provides necessary capital improvements, which provide benefit to (or mitigate the development impact of) the North Natomas Community Plan. All property owners in the NNCP area are required to participate equitably in the financing mechanisms necessary to finance the design, engineering, and construction of fire improvements provided for in the NNCP. Guarantees for this shall be via development agreements or other means acceptable to the City staff (NNCP, 92).

Police Protection Service
Prior to development, the City Police Department must verify adequate police protection facilities and services, including equipment and personnel, exists to serve the project, or will be provided, to maintain a police protection service standard of 1.6 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.6 police officers added either though a funded program, or as a condition of approval for the project.
The Financing Approach outlined in the NNCP defines the public and private responsibilities to provide community facilities (NNCP, 90). The Private sector provides necessary capital improvements, which provide benefit to (or mitigate the development impact of) the North Natomas Community Plan. All property owners in the NNCP area are required to participate equitably in the financing mechanisms necessary to finance the design, engineering, and construction of all police improvements provided for in the NNCP. Guarantees for this shall be via development agreements or other means acceptable to the City staff (NNCP, 92).

Schools
The following Guiding Policies direct City planning decisions in the North Natomas Community (NNCP, 61):

A. Provide quality public schools within convenient access to all students in the community.

B. Elementary schools shall serve as the focal point of a residential neighborhood with about 1,500 to 3,000 dwelling units.

The Financing Approach outlined in the NNCP defines the public and private responsibilities to provide community facilities (NNCP, 90). The Private sector provides necessary capital improvements, which provide benefit to (or mitigate the development impact of) the North Natomas Community Plan. Guarantees for this shall be via development agreements or other means acceptable to the City staff (NNCP, 92).

9. Prior to approval of any rezoning or land use entitlements for any residential land use within the NNCP area, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the appropriate school districts, which will ensure the provision of adequate school facilities to serve the residential dwelling units when needed. The appropriate school district and the building community will cooperate in drafting a financing plan, which will address the provisions of adequate school facilities to serve the planned residential areas when needed. The Plan will consider Mello-Roos financing and Impaction Fees among other possible sources of funds (NNCP, 91).

Sacramento City Code
SCC Title 15.36 Fire Code provides standards and specifications for the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from fire or explosion. This code ensures that projects are planned to provide adequate safety for building occupants and to maximize the ability of the fire department to respond to emergencies. Likewise, SCC Title 15.80 Personal Safety Code states that all projects shall be reviewed to determine that levels of public and personal safety are provided.

Impact Mechanisms
Proposed projects that create a demand for public services may necessitate the construction of public facilities.

Impact Assessment

a) *Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in fire protection?*

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The proposed project will increase demand for fire protection services and will necessitate capital improvements to provide adequate protection to maintain the 2.0 fire insurance rating. Impacts to fire protection services associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of fire protection services. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

The proposed project does not significantly alter the density or intensity of development designated in the SGPU and NNCP. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services are considered less than significant.

Impact Significance: Less than significant.
Mitigation Measures: None required.

b) Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in police protection?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The proposed project will increase demand for police protection services and will necessitate capital improvements to provide adequate protection to maintain a police protection service standard of 1.6 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.6 police officers. Impacts to police protection services associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of police protection services. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

The proposed project does not significantly alter the density or intensity of development designated in the SGPU and NNCP. Therefore, impacts on police protection services are considered less than significant.

Impact Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c) Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in schools?

Answer: Potential impact.

Potential Impact: The proposed project will increase demand for schools. Impacts to police protection services associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which states (NNCP, 91) “Prior to approval of any rezoning or land use entitlements for any residential land use within the NNCP area, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the appropriate school districts, which will ensure the provision of adequate school facilities to serve the residential dwelling units when needed.”

Impact Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

D) Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in maintenance of public facilities, including roads, or

E) other governmental services?

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impact: As discussed in the Impact Assessment questions 10. a – c above, all development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of public services. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

Impact Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.
11. Utilities/ Service Systems

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Sewer or septic tanks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Storm water drainage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Solid waste disposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Local or regional water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

The evaluation of significance on utilities/service systems is based on questions 11. a-g in the environmental checklist.

Impact Mechanisms

Projects that create a demand for public utilities and service systems may necessitate the construction or expansion of public facilities such as storm drainage systems and wastewater treatment facilities.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located in the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento (Taylor Monument quad, T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project site is currently vacant. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road. The El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a borders the project area on the west, south of South Loop Road. North of South Loop Road, the Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north. The entire project site and bordering properties are planned for residential and mixed-use development by the SGPU and the NNCP.

Water

The Water Division of the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, provides water to the project site. Approximately 75% of the potable water for the entire City is obtained from surface waters, the American and Sacramento Rivers and the remaining 25% is obtained from wells (personal communication, D. Schamber, City of Sacramento Department of Utilities). The North Natomas area is served primarily by surface sources such as the American and Sacramento Rivers (personal communication, D. Schamber, City of Sacramento Department of Utilities).

Sewer

The County Sanitation District Number 1 (CSD – 1) and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District provides sewer service to North Natomas (SGPU, I-1). Using the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) assumptions for sewage generation, the project site would generate approximately 485,200 gallons of sewage per day. Calculation based on 2,000 gallons multiplied by 242.6 acres of development = 485,200 gallons of sewage per day. The County of Sacramento has indicated that that sanitary sewer service is available to the project site after payment of applicable connection fees. The cost of sewer lateral extension and sewer service installation to the property line is the responsibility of the developer (SGPU, I-7).
Drainage
The project study area is within the Detention Basin 7a watershed area of the North Natomas drainage system. The City of Sacramento Utilities Department has indicated that prior to approval of the final master parcel map the applicant shall enter into a Drainage agreement with the other developers within the Detention Basin 7a watershed to design, construct, and/or finance the design and construction necessary to provide the basin and trunk lines. The applicant is required to provide adequate storm water drainage to the satisfaction of the City Utilities Director.

Regulatory Setting

City of Sacramento General Plan
The following Overall Goals in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-56):

Goal A: Provide a high quality of public facilities and services to all areas of the City.

Goal B: Time all new public facilities and services as closely as possible to approved City expansion.

Goal D: Achieve economy and efficiency in the provision of services and facilities.

Goal E: Design public facilities in such a manner as to ensure safety and attractiveness.

Water
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-56):

Goal A: Provide and improve water supply facilities to meet the future growth of the City and assure a continued supply of safe potable water.

Policy 3: Work with property owners to develop financing arrangements in order to provide needed water facilities in newly developed areas.

The Water Division of the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities, provides water to the project site. City water is provided to areas in the City as they develop. The capital costs of the distribution system are borne by the developer. Developers must directly pay for 12-inch and smaller lines. Financing of new transmission lines and water treatment and storage facilities is accomplished through imposition of development fees. Higher fees are charged for larger service connections such as commercial and industrial uses. Placement and sizing of water transmission and distribution lines are determined by City Staff. After the water distribution facilities have been installed, the City operates and maintains the system (SGPU, H-7).

Sewer
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-57):

Goal A: Provide adequate sewer service for all urbanized or developing neighborhoods.

Policy 3: Work with property owners to develop financing arrangements in order to provide sewer services.

To accommodate growth under the SGPU, expansion of the interceptor system to convey sewage flow to the Regional Plant is required. The Natomas Interceptor, the Dry Creek Interceptor, and the Northeast Interceptor require modification. Expansion of the Natomas Pump Station is also needed prior to major development in North Natomas (SGPU, I-8). The costs of major facility requirements are borne by the developers who benefit from them in the most equitable means possible (SGPU, I-9).

Drainage
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-58):
Goal A: Provide adequate drainage facilities and services to accommodate desired growth levels.

Policy 1: Ensure that all drainage facilities are adequately sized and constructed to accommodate the projected increase in stormwater runoff from urbanization.

Policy 4: Require the private sector to form assessment districts to cover the cost of providing drainage services.

As the North Natomas area is developed new drainage systems and substantial reconstruction of existing agricultural systems is required (SGPU, J-6). The City of Sacramento requires developers to provide all of the drainage facilities needed to support development (SGPU, J-4).

Solid Waste
The following goals and policies in the SGPU Public Facilities and Services Element direct City planning decisions and are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-58):

Goal A: Provide for adequate solid waste disposal facilities and services for collection, storage, and reuse of refuse.

The SGPU identifies the need to expand recycling efforts to mitigate for the increased demand for solid waste disposal in the City of Sacramento (SGPU, K-7).

North Natomas Community Plan
The following Guiding Policies direct City planning decisions in the North Natomas Community (NNCP, 73):

A. Provide public and private utilities to all land uses in the North Natomas Community.

B. Provide Guidance necessary for new development to demonstrate the provision of adequate public facilities and services.

C. Maintain adequate levels of service to prevent services from being insufficient and deteriorating as growth occurs.

D. Levels of service shall be consistent with policies contained in the respective elements of the General Plan or Master Plans prepared by respective service providers.

Water
Prior to any development occurring, the City Utilities Department must verify that adequate water supply system capacity exists to serve the specific project or will be provided through a funded program and/or a condition of approval of the project (NNCP, 74).

Incorporate water conservation measures such as landscaping with drought tolerant plants and installing water efficient irrigation systems and plumbing facilities in residential and non-residential development projects (NNCP, 89).

Sewer
Prior to development occurring, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, CSD — 1, and the City Utilities Department must verify that adequate sanitary sewer system capacity exists to serve the specific project or will be provided through a funded program and/or a condition of approval of the project (NNCP, 73).

Drainage
To ensure that adequate drainage facilities are in place prior to development occurring, and to ensure that funding is available to implement the entire comprehensive drainage plan when development is complete, all drainage agreements needed to accomplish the Comprehensive Drainage Plan must be executed prior to approval of any incremental development. Drainage agreements must be executed that are consistent with the
Comprehensive Drainage Plan and are legally sufficient to ensure its completion (NNCP, 70). Funding for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of all the facilities constructed or improved under the Comprehensive Drainage Plan will be proportioned among those users that benefit by the facilities and with the purpose of the facility (NNCP, 71).

**Solid Waste**
Prior to any development occurring, the City County Solid Waste Joint Powers Authority must verify that waste removal service and disposal facilities exist to serve the project or will be provided through a funded program. A curbside recycling program shall be required as part of the collection service (NNCP, 74).

The Financing Approach outlined in the NNCP defines the public and private responsibilities to provide community facilities (NNCP, 90).

- The Private sector shall provide necessary capital improvements, which provide benefit to (or mitigate development impact of) the North Natomas Community Plan. Exceptions to this requirement shall be limited to those improvements (if any), which are subject to a formal agreement with the City that specifically provides an alternative funding arrangement.
- Where a particular capital improvement will prove specific and special benefit to land beyond the North Natomas Community Plan area, the City will identify available funding sources to defray the regional component of the cost of the improvement.
- The City of Sacramento will provide traditional maintenance and operation services to the North Natomas Community Plan area after capital improvements are installed and development occurs, consistent with all the criteria and standards detailed in the adopted North Natomas Community Plan.

All property owners in the NNCP area are required to participate equitably in the financing mechanisms necessary to finance the design, engineering, and construction of all library, fire, police, street, traffic, water, sewer, drainage improvements and all monitoring programs provided for in the NNCP. Guarantees for this shall be via development agreements or other means acceptable to the City staff (NNCP, 92).

**Sacramento City Code**

SCC Title 13.04 Water Services provides that the Division of Water Public Works Department will furnish safe and potable water meeting the standards of the California Management and Safety Code. The Public Utilities Department is entitled to design plan review.

SCC Title 13.08 Sewer Service System provides that the City of Sacramento will provide a public sewer system. The Public Utilities Department is entitled to design plan review.

SCC Title 13.10 Garbage Collection and Disposal provides that it shall be the duty of the Division of Solid Waste of the Public Works Department to gather, collect, recycle, reconstitute, recover and dispose of by landfilling or sale all garbage, rubbish and waste matter within the city. The Public Works Department is entitled to design plan review.

SCC Title 13.13 Stormwater Management and Discharge Control regulates non-stormwater discharges to the stormwater conveyance system, discharges to the stormwater conveyance system from spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other than stormwater, and pollutants in urban stormwater discharges.

SCC Title 17.72 Zoning Recycling and Solid Waste Disposal Regulations regulates the location, size, and design features of recycling and trash enclosures in order to provide adequate, convenient space for the collection, storage, and loading of recyclable and solid waste material for existing and new development; increases recycling of used materials; and reduces litter. This chapter requires that all non-residential (commercial, office, industrial, and public/quasi-public) and residential (multifamily of five or more units) development prepare and submit a recycling program with the planning application before issuance of a building permit. The recycling program must include: 1) a flow chart depicting the routing of recycled materials, 2) a site plan specifying the location and design components and storage locations associated with recycling efforts, 3) a construction plan to specify the recyclable materials being used in the construction of the proposed structures, 4) a demolition plan specifying the proposed
recycling or reusable or recyclable building material in the demolition of any existing structures, and 5) an education program pertaining to recycling. Single family residential units and multiple family residential uses (four units or less) will be provided with curbside recycling service by the City. Design features in residential units should enhance the likelihood of recycling.

**California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939)**

AB 939 mandates that cities develop source reduction and recycling plans. The goal of AB 939 is to require cities to divert 25% of the waste stream from going to landfills by 1996 and to divert 50% of the waste stream from going to landfills by the year 2000. The SCC Zoning Ordinance has provisions pertaining to solid waste recycling that satisfy the requirements of AB 939.

**Impact Assessment**

**a) Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impacts:** The proposed project would result in an increased demand for potable water, irrigation water, and water for fire fighting. Prior to project approval, the City of Sacramento Utilities Department will verify whether water supply is sufficient to serve the project site. If water supply is not sufficient or the capacity of the infrastructure is limited, the applicant will provide the necessary improvements through a funded program proportionate to the project’s demand.

Impacts to public facilities associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of water treatment and distribution facilities. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**b) Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to sewer or septic tanks?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project would result in an increased demand for sewer service. The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, CSD – 1, and the City Utilities Department will verify that adequate sewer system capacity exists to serve project site. If sewer service is not sufficient or the capacity of the sewer service infrastructure is limited, the applicant will provide the necessary improvements through a funded program proportionate to the project’s demand.

Impacts to public facilities associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of sewer systems. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
c) **Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to storm water drainage?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project would result in increased stormwater runoff and greater demand on existing drainage capacity. A drainage agreement (proportional funding program) between all property owners within the Detention Basin 7a watershed must be executed to coordinate design and construction of improvements to obtain capacity required by the Comprehensive Drainage Plan. The project applicant will provide adequate stormwater drainage to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento Utilities Department.

Impacts to public facilities associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of drainage systems. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

d) **Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to solid waste disposal?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project would lead to increase of solid waste production that needs to be handled by the City solid waste system. However, no building is proposed with this application. Prior to construction of any building on the site, an approved Special Permit is required. During review of the Special Permit, the recycling program for the buildings will be evaluated. Because the project is subject to SCC 17.72, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact on solid waste disposal.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

e) **Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to local or regional water supplies?**

**Answer:** Potential impact.

**Potential Impacts:** The proposed project would result in an increased demand for potable water, irrigation water, and water for fire fighting. Prior to project approval, the City of Sacramento Utilities Department will verify whether water supply is sufficient to serve the project site. If water supply is not sufficient or the capacity of the infrastructure is limited, the applicant will provide the necessary improvements through a funded program proportionate to the project’s demand.

Impacts to public facilities associated with ultimate build-out of the NNCP were anticipated and disclosed in the NNCP. All development in North Natomas is subject to participation in the North Natomas Financing Plan, which outlines a program for financing improvement to and expansion of water supplies. The applicant will guarantee participation in the plan with the execution of the development agreement with the City.

**Level of Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
12. Aesthetics, Light and Glare

Would the proposal:

a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?  
   - Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Significant
   - No Impact

b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?  
   - Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Significant
   - No Impact

c) Create light and glare?  
   - Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Potentially Significant
   - Less Than Significant
   - No Impact

Criteria for Determining Significance

Projects that result in substantial changes to landforms, remove or add significant structures, result in visual clutter or disorder, or substantially disrupt the visual context with their surroundings would be considered to have a significant visual impact.

Impact Mechanisms

Structures and changes in landforms have an impact on the visual environment. The extent of the impact is based on several factors, such as the existing visual character of the area, the expectations of individuals viewing the area, and the location of the impact (foreground, middle ground, and background).

Environmental Setting

The 242.6-acre project site is currently vacant. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road. The El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a borders the project area on the west, south of South Loop Road. North of South Loop Road, the Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north. The entire project site and bordering properties are planned for residential and mixed-use development by the SGPU and the NNCP.

The proposed project would result in the construction of 211 low density residential units, 501 medium density residential units, 378 high density residential units, 870,000 ft² of office space, and institutional use(s). The project would also include two parks, freeway buffer, landscape corridors, and roadways and utility infrastructure.

The proposed project also seeks an amendment to the existing River View PUD to include the Parkview project within the River View PUD. The River View PUD Development Guidelines, which establish a design review committee and design standards for residential, commercial, and employment centers development, would be amended to include a second design review committee to review the Parkview development. The Parkview development would also be held to the design standards established in the River View PUD Development Guidelines.

Regulatory Setting

City of Sacramento General Plan

The SGPU describes the primary aesthetic review mechanism for residential and mixed-use development in the City of Sacramento is the zoning ordinance (SGPU, S-3). The PUD concept is one subsection of the zoning ordinance that encourages the design of well-planned facilities through creative and imaginative planning (SGPU, S-3). The PUD designation is intended to be utilized for large acreage developments capable of achieving distinct characteristics.
SGPU set the following goals (relevant to the proposed project) for aesthetic values within the SGPU area (S-11):

1. To enhance the aesthetic values of the community.
2. To improve the quality of the City environment for residents, visitors, and employees.
3. To encourage the development of an attractive, healthy, and aesthetically pleasant living environment.
4. To conserve and build upon the positive qualities of the City and at the same time eliminate those aspects which create negative perceptions.

The following SGPU Policies that help the City of Sacramento achieve its aesthetic goals are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, S-11 – S-12).

2) Enforce City codes to eliminate conditions such as unscreened storage, inoperative cars, overgrown weeds, and litter;
3) Encourage the use of landscaping treatments alongside subdivision walls to avoid visual monotony;
4) Encourage landscaping in all developed areas, including planting median strips and large canopy trees;
7) Enforce City codes regarding landscaping improvements to ensure that, within 15 years after establishment of a parking lot, at least 50% of the parking lot will be shaded;
13) Continue existing City policies to:
   - Require Subdivision Review Committee review of tentative subdivision maps, giving particular emphasis to aesthetic and environmental consideration,
   - Encourage the retention of mature trees, open space greenbelts, and other attractive features within new private projects,
   - Require street landscaping and tree planting,
   - Encourage appropriate design features in buildings,
   - Require underground utilities;
14) Continue to develop urban design standards which provide open space, attractive landscaping, and encourage creative design features which are sensitive to the urban forms, scales, and patterns found in the city;

North Natomas Community Plan
The Environmental Design Standards in the NNCP sets three basic levels of standards (NNCP, 82): 1) Community-Wide Design Standards, 2) System Design Standards, and 3) Project Design Standards. The Project Design Standards apply to specific PUDs and projects (NNCP, 87). The River View PUD Development Guidelines follow the framework of the North Natomas Model Development Guidelines (City of Sacramento 1994). The following Project Design Standards apply to the proposed project (NNCP, 87 - 89):

PUD Requirement
PUD Requirement: All development in North Natomas will be developed within a PUD.

Subject to Section 8 of the Zoning Ordinance: The PUD designation appearing on the official zoning map indicates that the property so classified is subject to the requirements and restrictions of Section 8 of the Zoning Ordinance in addition to the underlying zone.

Special Permit Required: A special Permit shall be required for any development in a PUD.

Site Design
Design Review Process: The City’s Design Review process shall apply to all residential and non-residential projects within all PUDs in North Natomas.

Open Space: Encourage developers to incorporate private open space/ recreational uses in medium and high
density residential projects and employment centers.

Building Design

Building Heights: All building heights in North Natomas should be regulated. Primarily low scale development should be done to maintain the visibility and identifiability of the Downtown when seen from within North Natomas or long major transportation corridors.

Mitigate Light and Glare Impacts: Buildings will need to mitigate light and glare impacts project by project, depending on building materials, orientation, and proximity to sensitive light receptors.

Landscape Guidelines

Landscape Plan: Landscape plans shall be required for all projects at the special permit stage and the phasing of the landscape and irrigation installation should be described.

Early Phasing Landscaping: Where proposed projects abut major thoroughfares and transportation corridors, applicants should be required as a condition of project approval to plant landscaping around the periphery of their sites as an initial or early phase of project implementation.

Choose Appropriate Tree Species for Building Areas: Provide appropriate tree species in appropriate locations around buildings to reduce summer cooling loads and allow solar gain during winter.

Landscapeed Berms within Parking Lots: Use of landscaped berms should be encouraged in and around parking lots. Care should be taken not to create barriers to pedestrian travel or to waste water due to sprinkler water.

Choose Appropriate Shade Trees for Parking Lots: Landscape guidelines should emphasize the planting of trees with large spreads to help shade parking lots and with branches which grow or are pruned well up trunks so that there is an ample canopy of vegetation while maintaining visibility and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

Sacramento City Code

SCC Title 17.180 Planned Unit Developments (PUDS) Regulations and Maps: The purpose of this chapter is to provide for greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of zoning regulations. It is the intent of this chapter to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing or other land uses through creative and imaginative planning.

Except as otherwise provided in the special permit or in the resolution to designate the PUD, no building permit shall be issued for any building or structure within the boundaries of a PUD until the plans submitted for the building permit have been reviewed by the planning director to determine that said plans conform to a valid special permit issued for a PUD under this chapter. No building or structure unit within a PUD may be occupied until an inspection of the project has been made by the planning director to see that all conditions of the special permit have been complied with.

SCC Title 17.212 Special Permits: A special permit may be granted at the discretion of the zoning administrator, planning commission or city council and is not the automatic right of any applicant. In considering an application for a special permit, the following guidelines shall be observed:

A. Sound Principles of Land Use. A special permit shall be granted upon sound principles of land use.
B. Not Injurious. A special permit shall not be granted if it will be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or if it results in the creation of a nuisance.
C. Must Relate to a Plan. A special permit use must comply with the objectives of the general or specific plan for the area in which it is to be located.

SCC Title 17.68.010 Landscaping Requirements, Part A.3 requires that all minimum front and street side set backs shall be landscaped, irrigated and maintained with primarily low ground cover or turf. Only living vegetation may be used as ground cover. Part C of the same chapter requires that trees shall be planted and
maintained throughout any surface parking lot to ensure that, within 15 years after establishment of the parking lot, at least 50% of the parking lot will be shaded.

SCC Title 17.68.030 Other Site Requirements, Part B states that exterior lighting shall reflect away from residential area and public streets.

**Impact Assessment**

**a) Would the proposal affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?**

**Answer:** No.

**b) Would the proposal have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?**

**Answer:** Potential Impact.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project would develop 242.6 acres of currently vacant land with residential and mixed-use land uses. The development would be a significant change in the existing landscape. Initial phases of the project would involve site preparation, road construction, installation of utility lines, and construction of houses, office buildings and institutional uses. However, construction of the project would not have a demonstrable negative effect because the surrounding land uses are planned for similar development. Residential development is a common and accepted part of the urban landscape in the City of Sacramento.

No building is proposed with this application. Because the project site is zoned as a PUD, prior to issuance of any building permit, an approved Special Permit is required. Any building must comply with the design criteria in the approved River View PUD Development Guidelines, which is consistent with the North Natomas Model Development Guidelines (City of Sacramento 1994). The City’s Design Review process, including plan review for aesthetic and environmental considerations, applies to all residential and non-residential projects within all PUDs in North Natomas.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**c) Would the proposal create light and glare?**

**Answer:** Potential Impact.

**Potential Impact:** Implementation of the proposed project could result in the creation of new sources of light and/or glare. However, compliance with SCC Titles 17.24 and 17.68.030 Part B will ensure that exterior lighting is appropriate and will be reflected away neighboring land uses.

The NNCP states that buildings need to mitigate light and glare impacts project by project, depending on building materials, orientation, and proximity to sensitive light receptors (NNCP, 88). The design review and Special Permit requirements that apply to development within PUDs help ensure that impacts resulting from new sources of light and glare will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
13. Cultural

Would the proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Implication</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Disturb paleontological resources?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Disturb archeological resources?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Affect historical resources?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Determining Significance

According to CEQA, an impact is considered significant if it would disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group. A project may have an adverse effect on a historic property if the effect diminishes the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. A project has an adverse effect on a historic property if it alters the characteristics of the property that may qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), including alteration of location, setting, or use.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located on the northwest corner of the San Juan Road overpass at Interstate 5, in the City of Sacramento, CA. The project study area occurs on the Taylor Monument USGS Topographic Quadrangle (T9N, R4E, Sections 14 and 15). The project is located within the SGPU area and the NNCP area. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road. The El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a borders the project area on the west, south of South Loop Road. North of South Loop Road, the Gateway West PUD borders the project area to the west and to the north.

In 1999, PAR Environmental Services, Inc. (PAR) prepared “A Cultural Resource Inventory of the Natomas Crossing Area 4 Project, Sacramento, California.” PAR conducted a records search and a historical map review for the project site. A mixed coverage strategy survey of the project site was also included in the study. No previously unrecorded resources were identified during the survey (PAR, 9). A razed ranch complex is located on the project site near Interstate 5. The buildings do not appear to satisfy the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources, nor do they satisfy the uniqueness criterion of CEQA Section 21083.2 (PAR, 12). One prehistoric find has been recorded in the vicinity of the project. PAR reports that Chavez (1984) noted an isolated obsidian flake adjacent to the western edge of project study area (PAR, 9). This area has been excavated approximately 15 to 20 feet deep as part of the El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a project. Two historic sites have been recorded in the vicinity of the project study area. The project is located wholly within the Reclamation District 1000 (HAER No. CA-187), which is classed as a Historic Rural Landscape (PAR, 11). Witter Ranch, a National Register Site, occurs west of the El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a (PAR, 12).
Regulatory Setting

Cultural resources are treated under two areas of code: CEQA Section 21083.2 and Section 21084.1 and California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1a-i and Section 5097.5a. CEQA Section 21083.2 defines a “unique archeological resource” as:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its types.
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

CEQA Section 21084.1 defines a significant historical resource as a resource listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR. Any resource that has been determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP will be considered eligible for the CRHR. Any resource included in a local register of historical resources, or that has been identified in a historical resources survey that meets the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g) is considered a historical resource.

The PRC Section 5097.5a protects prehistoric and historical resources, geologic, and paleontological resources. PRC Section 5097.5a reads, in part, “No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface, any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, rock art, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature.”

Projects that receive funding or require approvals from a federal agency, e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, must meet not only CEQA requirements but also requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

City of Sacramento General Plan

The SGPU determined that the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to level of less than significant (SGPU, V-7 – V-8):

1. Required consultation with the North Central Information Center to identify known cultural resources and potential cultural resources that could be found on land proposed for development.
2. Require an archeological field survey if development area is sensitive.
3. Implement specific preservation measures recommended by the survey archeologist.
4. Cease construction activities and consult qualified archeologists upon discovery of potential cultural resources.
5. Maintain confidentiality of significant prehistoric resource locations.
6. Adopt cultural resource policies as part of the SGPU.

North Natomas Community Plan

The NNCP provides community-wide design standards for the protection of archeological and historical resources (NNCP, 85):

1. Field Reconnaissance Required: A comprehensive field survey should be completed for any development planned in the vicinity of a recorded archeological site in full consultation with the Native American community and the State Historic Preservation Office.
2. Halt Work if Artifacts Found: If artifacts are found, work will stop and a qualified archeologist shall be consulted.
3. In-Place Preservation Preferred: In-place preservation if archeological sites would likely require the redesign of the development to incorporate the site into an open space area.
Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal disturb paleontological resources?

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impact: The project proposes to develop 242.6 acres with residential and employment center land uses. Although no paleontological indicators were identified within the APE (PAR, 9), grading activities could reveal paleontological resources not previously identified. Pursuant to PRC 5097.5a (knowingly and willfully excavate upon historic, prehistoric, or paleontological resources), the project may not affect such resources. Both SGPU and NNCP require construction to cease if cultural resources are unearthed during grading and excavation activities.

No cemeteries were identified in the APE in the historical archival record search. The project site has been fully impacted by soil disturbance and no human remains have been previously identified. Pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are unearthed during construction, the construction contractor will cease work within 100 ft of the discovery and notify the City of Sacramento of the find. The City shall notify the County Coroner and no further disturbance shall occur until the Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origins and disposition pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 13-1 If subsurface paleontological resources are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, work in the affected area shall stop immediately and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any impact to a less than significant level before construction continues.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

b) Would the proposal disturb archeological resources?

Answer: Potential Impact.

Potential Impact: The project proposes to develop 242.6 acres with residential and employment center land uses. Although no archeological indicators were identified within the APE (PAR, 9), grading activities could reveal archeological resources not previously identified. Pursuant to PRC 5097.5a (knowingly and willfully excavate upon historic, prehistoric, or paleontological resources), the project may not affect such resources. Both SGPU and NNCP require construction to cease if cultural resources are unearthed during grading and excavation activities.

Level of Significance: Less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 13-2 If subsurface archaeological or historical remains (including, but not limited to, unusual amounts of bones, stones, or shells) are discovered during excavation or construction of the site, work in the affected area 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.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

c) Would the proposal affect historical resources?

Answer: Potential impact.
Potential Impact: Two historical resources occur within the vicinity of the project study area: 1) Witter Ranch National Historic Site and 2) Reclamation District 1000 Historic Rural Landscape. The project will not directly affect the Witter Ranch Historic Site. The El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a provides a physical and visual buffer between the ranch and the western border of the project site.

Construction and development will directly affect the integrity of the property included within the Reclamation District 1000 Historic Rural Landscape. However, the firm that prepared the Historic American Engineering Record (Peak and Associates, Inc., 1997) anticipated this impact.

"The resulting increase in development that will result from the improved flood protection will have an adverse effect on the contributing elements of the district – the drainage and road systems, and large-scale land patterns – due to the physical destruction or alteration of these resources. Alterations to the individual contributing resources will result in loss of integrity to the district (Peak 1997, 65)."

As Peak noted, continuing development is a direct result of the continuing work on flood control (PAR, 11). This is the direct consequence of the original flood control efforts that created Reclamation District 1000 (PAR, 11).

Level of Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d) Would the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?
Answer: No.

e) Would the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?
Answer: No.
14. Recreation

Would the proposal:

a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?

b) Affect existing recreation opportunities?

c) Criteria for Determining Significance

- An impact on recreation would be considered significant if it would:
  - increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, or
  - include the loss or degradation of existing recreational facilities.

Impact Mechanisms

Projects that create a demand for recreation may necessitate the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Project that result in the change of land use designated for park use for another land use.

Environmental Setting

The project is located within the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project area to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road, North of South Loop Road, the El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a borders the project area to the west and to the north.

Impact of the project on recreation, the project area and its environs is classified as "Less Than Potentially Significant." The reason for this classification is that the proposal will not create a demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Environmental Setting

The project is located within the NNCP area of the City of Sacramento. Interstate 5 bounds the project area to the east and San Juan Road bounds the project area to the south. The River View PUD occurs south of San Juan Road. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road, North of South Loop Road, the El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a borders the project area to the west and to the north.

The project proposes to develop two Neighborhood Parks along the south side of the project area. The first park (Center Park) would be located west of Duckhorn Boulevard and south of South Loop Road and would be the focal point of the Low Density Residential area. Center Park is planned to be 5 acres. The second park (East Park) would be located east of Duckhorn Boulevard and would be the focal point of the Employment Center area. East Park is planned to be 2.6 acres.

In addition to the proposed parks, open space opportunities occur within the 100-foot wide Interstate 5 freeway buffer. The project area is bisected by South Loop Road, the El Centro Drain and Detention Basin 7a on the west side of the lot proposed for institutional use. A map showing the 880-foot walking distance to open space opportunities is provided in Appendix A (Figure 9).
desires of each neighborhood and community. Attempt to achieve the park acreage standards in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The park acreage standard in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is 5 acres per 1,000 residents or approximately 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents for Neighborhood Parks and 2.5 acres for Community Parks per 1,000 residents.

The SGPU adopted the following policies to achieve Goal A that are applicable to the proposed project (SGPU, C-61):

Policy 1: Encourage private development of recreational facilities that complement and supplement the public recreational system.

Policy 4: Reserve and acquire when needed all park sites designated in Community Plans and specific plans.

Policy 5: Design parks to enhance and preserve the natural site characteristics.

Policy 6: Review all necessary infrastructure improvements for their potential park and open space usage.

Policy 7: Locate community and regional nodal and linear recreational areas on or adjacent to major thoroughfares.

Policy 9: Continue the practice of providing neighborhood outdoor recreation facilities on or adjacent to public schools.

**North Natomas Community Plan**

The NNCP sets the following Guiding Policies for parks in North Natomas (NNCP, 56):

A. Every resident and worker shall have convenient access to active and passive recreational opportunities.

B. Parks should be evenly distributed throughout residential neighborhoods based on population.

C. Develop parks with a joint use agreement with other compatible users where possible to provide financial savings,

The following Implementing Policies (applicable to the proposed project) were established by the NNCP based on the Guiding Policies (NNCP, 56 – 57):

**Park and Open Space Access Standard:** Eighty percent of the residential units shall be located within 880 feet of some form of public or private open space element. The access standard is based on actual walking distance – rather than radius.

**Park Dedication Standard:** The standard for park dedication by the developers is 5 acres per 1,000 residents or approximately 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents for Neighborhood Parks and the same for Community Parks. The City Parks Department must verify the park standard has been met with dedicated parklands or in-lieu fee credit.

**Park Size:** Four types of parks will be developed to serve the North Natomas Community: 1) Neighborhood Park (2 – 10 acres to serve a 0.5-mile radius), 2) Community Park (6 – 60 acres to serve a 3-mile radius), 3) a Regional Park (200 acres to serve the entire City), and Linear Parkways (a linear park or closely interconnected system of parks located along a circulation, utility, drainage, or other common corridor that takes multiple advantage of existing rights-of-way).

**Park Location Criteria:** Parks with active recreational uses that may negatively impact residential areas due to traffic, noise, and lighting should be sited so as to have a minimal impact on surrounding residences.

**Park Phasing:** Neighborhood and community parks must be provided when a minimum of 50% of the
residential land development in the park service area is completed.

Impact Assessment

a) Would the proposal increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?

Answer: Potential impact.

No Impact: The proposed project will result in an increase in the demand for parks due to the increase in population within the project site. The proposed project is consistent with the Park and Open Space Access Standard set by the NNCP. The project as proposed provides 91% of the residential lots with open space opportunities within 880 feet walking distance (Appendix A, Figure 9).

Potential Impact: The proposed project will result in an increase in the demand for parks due to the increase in population within the project site. However, the proposed project is inconsistent with the Park Dedication Standard of the NNCP.

Park Dedication Standard: The SGPU, the Sacramento Master Park Plan, and the NNCP standard for park dedication by the developers is 5 acres per 1,000 residents or approximately 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents for Neighborhood Parks and the same ratio for Community Parks.

The proposed project will result in approximately 3,985 new residents. Pursuant to the City plans, the project is required to provide a total of 19.93 acres of parks (9.97 acres of Neighborhood Parks and 9.97 acres of Community Parks). The project as proposed provides a total of 7.6 acres of parks (7.6 acres of Neighborhood Parks and zero acres of Community Parks).

The City Parks Department requires the park dedication standard to be met prior to project approval. The City Parks Department will verify that the park standard has been met with dedicated parklands and/or with capital improvements to existing parks and/or with in-lieu fee credit. Prior to approval of the Parkview tentative subdivision map, the project applicant must have entered into an agreement with the City Parks Department that the applicant will construct improvements to Detention Basin 7a at the developer's expense (personal communication, H. Hesterman, City of Sacramento Parks Department). The process of the City Parks Department's verification of the applicant's adherence to the park dedication standard reduces the potential impacts to less than significant.

Impact Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project will result in an increase in the demand for parks due to the increase in population within the project site. However, the proposed project is inconsistent with the Park Location Standard of the NNCP.

Park Location Criteria: Parks with active recreational uses that may negatively impact residential areas due to traffic, noise, and lighting should be sited so as to have a minimal impact on surrounding residences.

The City Parks Department considers the 5-acre Center Park a Neighborhood Park. The City Parks Department does not generally plan these parks to serve large gatherings. Community Parks serve large gatherings and typically incur more visitors, resulting in potential traffic, noise, and night lighting impacts on residences adjacent to the park (personal communication, H. Hesterman, City of Sacramento Parks Department). Park uses under consideration include a bantam soccer field, tennis courts, basketball courts, grass volleyball courts, play equipment for children, a covered picnic area, a restroom, open turf, and a bocce ball facility (personal communication H. Hesterman, City of Sacramento Parks Department). Some of these uses could result in traffic, noise, and night lighting impacts to the residences adjacent to the park. The following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact of a large gathering type park uses
within a designated Neighborhood Park to less than significant.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

**Mitigation Measures:**

MM 14-1 The Development Agreement between the applicant and the City of Sacramento shall include a clause that requires the developer to provide a written statement that discloses what types of uses will be permitted within the 5-acre Center Park to prospective buyers of homes facing the Center Park and Basin 7a.

**Impact Significance After Mitigation:** Less than significant. By providing prospective buyers of homes facing the Center Park and Basin 7a, potential impacts will be disclosed and the potential buyer will be able to assess his/her tolerance of the potential effects and make an informed purchasing decision.

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project will result in an increase in the demand for parks due to the increase in population within the project site.

**Park Maintenance:** The new parks that will be constructed as a result of approval of the proposed project will result in an increased demand on the City of Sacramento Park Maintenance Department Resources. The City Parks Department will require the project applicant to enter into an agreement to include the proposed subdivision in a Lighting and Landscaping District. By establishing the Lighting and Landscaping District the City will be assured that funds will be assessed to provide maintenance services.

**Impact Significance:** Less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

b) **Would the proposal affect existing recreation opportunities?**

**Answer:** No. The proposed project site is vacant land not currently used for recreational purposes. The SGPU has designated 19.2 acres for Park/Recreation/Open Space. The proposed project would increase the number of acres designated for Park/Recreation/Open Space by 13% for a total of 22.1.
15. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

Answer: Yes. However, all potential project impacts will either avoided or reduced to less than significant through project design or by the implementation of mitigation measures as described in this document.

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

No.

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

No.
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