Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero and K Street Barge Repair Project #PB15-030

January 2016, Revised March 2016

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero and K Street Barge Repair Project (PB15-030) - The Project is located on the Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero, downtown in the City of Sacramento along the east bank of the Sacramento River generally between I Street and L Street. The Project site is approximately 1.5 acres, bounded on the west by the Sacramento River, Joe’s Crab Shack, Hornblower River Cruise, the Rio City Café, and the Delta King Hotel; on the north by the I Street Bridge; to the east by the Sacramento Southern Pacific Railroad, a playground, historic schoolhouse, shops and restaurants along Front Street; and on the south by Neasham Circle and Tower Bridge.

The Project includes two phases with the first phase consisting of removing and replacing the existing boardwalk decking; replacing the existing wood fascia on the floodwall; repairing the existing barge, dock, stairs, and elevator (hoistway); replacing lighting with new lighting system; removing the one-story addition on the south side of the Steamers Building; adding stairs to the elevated cantilevered sections of the Embarcadero; ADA improvements to the Embarcadero; replacing railroad ties and new concrete panels installed between the ties and tracks returned to original position; replacing existing railings; and installing wood overlays on the cantilevered sections that are not on a concrete deck. The second phase includes removing a pier section at the north end of the project site; installing and new maintenance platform at the California Pacific Steamers Building; and upgrading the existing bike path.

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

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

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (or 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with prior arrangement). The document is also available on the CDD website at: http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports

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

By:

Date: March 18, 2016
INTRODUCTION

This document presents, in strike-through (deleted text) and underline (new text) format, the revisions to the Old Sacramento Embarcadero and K Street Barge Repair Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that are a result of public and agency comments received on the Draft IS/MND. All comment letters and associated responses are found in Appendix D. The revisions to the Draft IS/MND reflected in this final document do not affect the adequacy of the previous environmental analysis contained in the IS/MND.

REVISED TEXT

In response to several comments received related to inaccurately identifying the American River Bike Trail as the trail within the project area, all discussions have been revised to refer to the Sacramento River Bike Trail.

In response to Comment 7-4 from the California State Lands Commission, the following text change has been made on page 26.

**Land Use**

The Project area is zoned by the City as a Central Business District (C-3) Commercial Zone with the area south of L Street and north of the Capitol Mall also having a Special Planning District designation. The areas north, south, and east of the Project Site are also zoned as Central Business District Commercial Zones with the area east of 3rd Street also having a having a Special Planning District designation. The Sacramento River is zoned by the City as part of the American River Parkway-Floodplain Zone (ARP-F). The City of Sacramento General Plan lists the Project area as Parks and Recreation with the area east of the railroad tracks listed as a Traditional Center with the surrounding area listed as a Central Business District. In addition, a portion of the project area is subject to CSLC Lease PRC 7001.1, a General Master Lease – Public Agency Use to the City.

Because the changes presented would not result in any new significant impacts or increase impact significance from what was identified in the Draft IS/MND, recirculation of the Old Sacramento Embarcadero and K Street Barge Repair Project IS/MND is not required.
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CO₂  carbon dioxide
CRHR California Register of Historical Resources
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>California Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>reactive organic gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Regional Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC</td>
<td>Spill Prevention Control and countermeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAB</td>
<td>Sacramento Valley Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWW</td>
<td>treated wood waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCP</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OLD SACRAMENTO RIVERFRONT EMBARCADERO AND K STREET BARGE REPAIR PROJECT
(PB15-030)

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

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

ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES CITED: Identifies source materials that have been consulted in preparation of the Initial Study.
## SECTION I - BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name and File Number:</th>
<th>Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero and K Street Barge Repair Project (Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>City of Sacramento, along the east bank of the Sacramento River between I street and L Street, in the Old Sacramento Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Applicant:</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Manager:             | Kirk Thompson, Architect  
Department of Public Works  
Facilities & Real Property Management  
5730 24th Street, Bldg. 4  
Sacramento, CA 95822 |
| Environmental Planner:      | Scott Johnson  
Community Development Department  
Environmental Planning Services  
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811 |
| Date Initial Study Completed:| January 4, 2016 |

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

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

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

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the Project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15177(d)). Policies included in the 2035 General Plan that reduce significant impacts identified in the Master EIR are identified and discussed. See also the Master EIR for the 2035 General Plan. The mitigation monitoring plan for the 2035 General Plan, which provides references to applicable general plan policies that reduce the environmental effects of development that may occur consistent with the general plan, is included in the adopting resolution for the Master EIR. See City Council Resolution No. 2015-0060, beginning on page 60. The resolution is available at http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx.

This analysis incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the 2035 General Plan Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15150(a)). The Master EIR is available for public review at the City of Sacramento.
Sacramento (address below) and on the City’s website (http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports).

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Written comments should be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending February 4, 2016.

Please send written responses to:

Scott Johnson
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
Direct Line: (916) 808-5842
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the Project as proposed by the City of Sacramento, Department of Public Works, which proposes to rehabilitate and repair the Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero; conduct upgrades on the K Street Barge; and improve a number of streetscape elements including lighting, bike path and pedestrian amenities, and small-scale landscape features to improve accessibility and correct deficiencies associated with deferred maintenance in the Project area.

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project is located on the Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero, downtown in the City of Sacramento along the east bank of the Sacramento River generally between I Street and L Street (Figure 1). The waterfront area was redeveloped in the mid-twentieth century and is located within the Old Sacramento Historic District, which was registered as a National Historic Landmark in 1966 by the National Park Service. Within the northern portion of the historic district are portions of the Sacramento Southern Rail line, the State Railroad Museum, and the Old Sacramento State Historic Park. The Old Sacramento Historic District, including and surrounding the Project site, preserves the original riverfront railroad levee, the riverside scene, with the Delta King paddlewheel steamer, cobblestone streets, boardwalks, nineteenth century-styled architecture and many other historic elements. Old Sacramento is home to numerous special events throughout the year, including the world-renowned Sacramento Music Festival, which attracts more than 300,000 visitors each Memorial Day Weekend.

The Project site is approximately 1.5 acres, bounded on the west by the Sacramento River, Joe’s Crab Shack, Hornblower River Cruise, the Rio City Café, and the Delta King Hotel; on the north by the I Street Bridge; to the east by the Sacramento Southern Pacific Railroad, a playground, historic schoolhouse, shops and restaurants along Front Street; and on the south by Neasham Circle and Tower Bridge.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Project area is zoned by the City of Sacramento as a Central Business District (C-3) Commercial Zone with the area south of L Street and North of the Capitol Mall also having a Special Planning District designation. The areas north, south, and east of the Project site are also zoned as Central Business District Commercial Zones with the area east of 3rd Street also having a Special Planning District designation. The City Code states that development in the C-3 Special Planning District is subject to the requirements of the underlying zone (City Code §17.408). The Sacramento River is zoned by the City as part of the American River Parkway (ARP-F). The 2015 City of Sacramento General Plan lists the Project area as Parks and Recreation with the area east of the railroad tracks listed as a Traditional Center with the surrounding area listed as a Central Business District (City of Sacramento 2015).

The existing boardwalk was constructed from 1984 to 1986 and is approximately 1,200 feet in length, with 60,000 square feet of exposed timber decking used as a walking surface. The riverfront boardwalk receives pedestrian and bicycle traffic from the American Sacramento River Bike Trail, and visitors to the Capitol Mall, the State Historic Park, restaurants, and shops in the Old Sacramento Historic District. Part of the boardwalk at the foot of K Street is currently used for valet parking for the Delta King Hotel. The docks west of the boardwalk area provide access to private and passenger boats, as well as the K Street Barge that allows access to the Delta King Hotel.
Figure 1. Project Area
The existing wood boards are experiencing extensive wear and degradation. Numerous tripping hazards are present along the Embarcadero (refer to Appendix A for site photos). In addition, the barge is in need of interior repairs to address structural deficiencies, leakage, rust, ventilation, and proper enclosure to the elements, as well as address existing access concerns.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The Project is needed to correct deficiencies related to accessibility and deferred maintenance at the Riverfront Embarcadero and at the K Street Barge. The Project will address concerns with the existing boardwalk related to the deterioration of the wood timber decking walking surface, and would improve access and structural integrity of the K Street Barge that supports the access facilities (stairs, elevator) for the Delta King Hotel. In addition, the Project includes streetscape improvements, including rehabilitation of the Embarcadero canopies, placement of compatible lighting, bike path realignment and resurfacing, infrastructural streetscape enhancements, as well as plantings and small-scale landscape enhancements and improvements. The purpose of these improvements is to make the Old Sacramento Embarcadero and surrounding Historic District accessible and safe for residents and visitors to enjoy, while maintaining historical value.

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals of the Project are to address accessibility concerns and maintenance along the Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero boardwalk and the K Street Barge.

Objectives to meet these goals include:

- Comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and address pedestrian safety concerns along the boardwalk, across the train tracks, and onto the K Street Barge.
- Ensure Project features that are easy to maintain and repair.
- Complement the historic district’s period of significance in the Project design, including using an appropriate timber replacement, compatible lighting, etc.
- Make improvements that are of high quality, durable, and affordable.
- Construct the Project in a way that is environmentally acceptable and preserves Sacramento River water quality.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Proposed Project components would be implemented over two Project phases, with a total of eight construction phases. Figure 2 shows the overall site plan, and Figure 3 shows a more detailed site plan. The Project components by phase are described fully below.
Figure 2. Overall Site Plan
Figure 3  Enlarged Site Plan, K Street
Phase 1

**REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING BOARDWALK DECKING**

The existing wood boards comprising the boardwalk were placed in the mid-1980s and are experiencing extensive wear and degradation. The wood boards are placed on a concrete slab-on-grade over aggregate base and are bolted in place. The bolts were installed in the concrete slab.

The repair involves removing the wood boards with a backhoe or similar equipment. The bolts would be snapped off at the top of the concrete and left in place. Any damaged concrete would be repaired. The concrete slab would remain to provide the structure for installation of the new paving material replacing the existing wood boards. The new paving material would be constructed of an integral colored stamped concrete. In addition, new concrete slab would be provided in areas of the boardwalk that currently do not contain an existing slab to support areas of new stamped concrete (Figure 3).

Currently, there are five shade structures along the cantilevered sections of the Embarcadero. The support posts for these structures are bolted to the existing wood decking. The wooden decking on these sections would be replaced with new wood and the existing shade structures removed and replaced with new canopies with corrugated steel roofing and supported by wood timbers. See Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C for Project elevations.

**REPLACE EXISTING WOOD FASCIA ON FLOODWALL**

The Sacramento River floodwall is a vertical concrete wall along the Embarcadero (refer to Appendix A for site photos). The top elevation of the wall is 34.5 feet above mean sea level (msl). In several areas, the floodwall fascia is constructed from a timber section. The face and top of the concrete wall has a wood fascia board to match the wood boards along the walking surface of the Embarcadero. There are existing openings in the floodwall, such as the entrance to the K Street Barge, where flood control is provided using stoplogs that slip into steel rails and cover the opening. The top of the stoplogs are at the elevation of the top of the concrete floodwall.

The repair would include removal of the existing wood fascia boards on both sides and top of the existing flood wall, and replacement with a new wood on the easterly (land) side, and a new wood on top of the floodwall to match the existing height. The westerly (river) side of the wall would remain exposed concrete. The bolts would be cut or ground flush with the face of the wall and the existing blemishes patched to match the adjacent concrete surface. Low-profile ground-illuminating lights would be placed in the wood veneer on the easterly (land) side of the floodwall (refer to Lighting Plan discussion below). The lights would be fed from the new conduit, which would be run behind new wood where there are currently existing conduits for other feeds, and existing conduit on the west side would be relocated behind new wood. These improvements do not require any cutting into or disturbance of the concrete floodwall.

**REPAIR EXISTING BARGE, DOCK AND STAIRS**

The Delta King is moored to a dock that is mounted on the hull of a barge that is moored to the riverbank. On top of the barge are an elevator, the north gangway, and stairs that provide a mostly accessible (ADA compliant) path of travel. There is also the south gangway from the boardwalk to third floor of the Delta King. The barge, as with the associated elements, rises and falls with the elevation of the river (refer to Appendix A for site photos).

The barge is in need of interior repairs to address leakage, rust, and proper enclosure to the elements. These repairs would be conducted on the interior of the barge and would not involve any alterations that would modify the obstruction to flow which results from the current barge.
Figure 4A. Site Sections, L Street and Rio City Cafe
Figure 4B. Site Sections, Service entry, K Street, and Observation Deck
Figure 4C. Site Sections, Raised Step Seating and J Street
The existing steel framed stairs that extend from the upper landing to the barge level would be modified to conform to current building code requirements as part of the Project. The existing riser height exceeds code maximum, the risers are open, and openings in the railings exceed code maximum. Replacement includes modifying the rise/run ratio and closing the vertical gap between the stairs. The existing wood treads would be reused, and new detailing would match the existing conditions. The exterior of the barge would also be refinished. This will require sand-blasting and possibly use of rust-removal chemicals to prepare the barge for refinishing. Because the stairs rise and fall with the river, they are above the active river flow and these modifications do not affect the flood capacity of the river.

**REPAIR EXISTING BARGE ELEVATOR (HOISTWAY)**

The existing elevator is contained in a steel and wood framed hoistway enclosure originally designed to reflect the architecture found within the Old Sacramento Historic District (refer to Appendix A for site photos). Repairs to the elevator would occur inside the hoistway and would not alter the horizontal or vertical footprint of the facility. There would also be repairs to some of the exterior siding and roof of the enclosure to address areas of rot or other wood decay. The existing roof would be replaced with corrugated metal roofing to match the new shade canopies. The repairs would not alter the footprint or the river flood capacity.

A new intermediate elevator stop and landing will be added midway between the barge level and upper level that connects to the gangway from the Embarcadero. The elevator enclosure would be modified to add the required opening. The landing at the new elevator stop would be connected directly to the Delta King by a new gangway. The new landing and gangway would match the existing architectural design style.

**LIGHTING**

To improve existing lighting levels along the boardwalk, the Project proposes a new lighting system. Light fixture types would be compatible with the embarcadero's historic rail and river-related shipping and warehouse periods (latter portion of the 19th and early 20th centuries) and would consist of metal housing and fish hook crook arm poles, as shown here. Poles would be 12 feet high and placed 20 to 25 feet to the east (land side) of the floodwall.

Lighting would also be placed on the posts that are part of the shade structures on the elevated cantilevered sections of the Embarcadero. Only the posts on the east sides of the shade structures would be used for lighting on the Embarcadero. Lighting would be energy efficient, using approximately 2,000 watts for all lighting. Light levels would substantially improve safety along the boardwalk. For the open canopies, indirect linear lights would be glare-free while maintaining light levels adequate for activities and safety.

Post holes would be augured about 4 feet below existing grade for placement of the light pole foundations. The landward side of the floodwall was previously filled to about the base of the floodwall. Assuming a typical levee prism with a 2:1 side slope, at 15 feet, the levee prism would be about 7.5 feet below grade. The proposed boring for the lamp pole foundations would be located above this elevation.

**MISCELLANEOUS PHASE 1 PROJECT MODIFICATIONS**

In addition to the above, Phase 1 of the Project includes the following minor modifications.

- On the south side of the Steamers Building is a one-story addition that would be removed.
- Stairs would be added to the elevated cantilevered sections of the Embarcadero.
- ADA access ramps on the east side of the Embarcadero would be improved.
• The existing railroad pedestrian crossing would be modified to address ADA access requirements. Existing tracks would be lifted, the railroad ties replaced, new concrete panels would be added in between the ties, and the tracks returned to original position.

• Existing railings throughout the Project area would be replaced, retaining alignments.

• Wood will be overlain on the cantilevered sections that are not on a concrete deck.

Phase 2

REMOVE PIER SECTION

At the north end of the Project site is a section of pier on the river side of the flood wall with the appearance of support from 12 driven piles adjacent to the river (refer to Appendix A for site photos). The actual construction is that the inboard side is attached to the concrete floodwall and the river side is marginally supported with a smaller number of the pilings. Many of the piles are not driven into the river bed or even touch the bed. The only purpose of this wooden structure is to support a private water main under the pier. Removing the structure would require relocating the water main to the face of the floodwall. Water service would be temporarily disrupted for 1 day. At least 1 week prior to shut-down, the City would notify all affected businesses. It is anticipated that minimal disruption would occur since the water main work would be completed during the early morning hours. Removal of the pier would require placing construction scaffolding (temporary) within the river edge in order to access the work area. Scaffolding would extend approximately 20 feet from the pier and approximately 5 feet from both sides of the work area. As an option to removal of the pier, the City is also considering leaving the pier in place, resurfacing it, and adding a guardrail to ensure public safety.

CALIFORNIA PACIFIC STEAMERS BUILDING NEW MAINTENANCE PLATFORM

The existing California Pacific Steamers Building is located north of the Rio City Café on the Embarcadero. The western façade is flush with the perimeter edge wood beams that face the river and as a result, maintenance on this building façade cannot be easily accessed. To accommodate the City’s ability to access and properly maintain the western building façade, a 2-inch thick galvanized open metal grating maintenance platform is proposed. The maintenance platform would comply with CalOSHA requirements for fall protection by providing a galvanized steel guardrail along the platform perimeter. Structural support for the new maintenance platform would include steel channel ledgers extending 4 feet over the river, which would be attached to the existing concrete beams located under the building. Installing the new maintenance platform would require placing construction scaffolding (temporary) within the river edge in order to access the work area. Scaffolding would extend approximately 20 feet from the Steamers Building and approximately 5 feet from both sides of the work area.

EXISTING BIKE PATH UPGRADE

The bike path from the I Street Bridge downstream to the boardwalk is on the river side of the floodwall and needs upgrades to address safety and access issues. The upgrades include resurfacing, tree removal, widening, new guardrail, and removal of decorative wood beams, similar to the boardwalk area. The wood beams are 2 feet high by 2 feet wide by 15 feet long and are attached to the floodwall. They serve a decorative function and their removal would decrease the amount of encroachment in the Sacramento River floodway. The widening of the bike trail can be partially accomplished through removal of the decorative wood beams and two mature trees. Other widening points will require removal of fill material and the placement of new fill in the floodway. However, there will be no excavation into the levee prism.

To minimize encroachment into the floodway, the widened sections could be on stem walls similar to existing sections. This would require excavating in the riverbank to construct a footing for the wall and
then back filling behind the wall. This footing would be located about 10 feet toward the river from the existing floodwall and about 2 feet lower than the base of the floodwall.

PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

Phase 1 Construction

Construction for Phase 1 of the Project is anticipated to begin late 2015 and end by summer of 2016. Construction would occur in six phases, with each phase requiring approximately 30 days (Figure 5). Table 1 summarizes the Project activities that would occur with each construction phase during Phase 1.

A total of approximately 0.5 acre of land would be disturbed during construction. Typically, 10-12 construction personnel would be on site during construction, with a maximum of 16. Construction contractor personnel would be required to park in the public parking garage. Construction hours would be from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

It is estimated that 102 truck-trips would be required to haul debris out, and 138 truck-trips to deliver concrete and other construction material. See Figure 6, Staging and Access Plan.

Phase 2 Construction

Phase 2 of the Project is anticipated to begin in 2017 and would occur over an approximate 1-month period and include two construction phases. Table 2 summarizes the Project activities that would occur with each construction phase. However, the construction start date would ultimately be determined by receipt of the required agency permits (Table 4).

Less than 0.2 acre of land would be disturbed during construction of Phase 2. A maximum of seven construction personnel would be on site during construction. Construction contractor personnel would be required to park in the public parking garage. Construction hours would be from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

It is estimated that 4 truck trips would be required to haul debris out and construction material to the Project site.

Construction Activities and Equipment

For both phases of construction, equipment used for the Project includes typical pieces of general construction equipment and also specialized equipment. Specialized equipment would be portable and include the following:

- Debris containment system, use of barrier tarp or polyethylene plastic sheeting with vacuum function, and netting suspension under/around scaffolding.
- Recovery systems for sawdust, drill dust/slurry, such as hand drill dust collector.
- Water containment system would be established to ensure that contaminated water from paint and rust removal, and water used to wash and clean surfaces is fully captured to prevent water contamination.

In addition to these specialized pieces of equipment, more typical construction equipment would be utilized (Table 3).
Figure 5. Phasing Plan

1. All construction material will be staged at the park and relocated between the hours of 7 am and 10 am to the areas of work with spotters escorting equipment.
2. The Construction Trailer will be located between the restrooms and the railroad tracks. There will only be minimal parking spaces available for trailer staff.
3. Construction hours will be 7 am to 3:30 pm.
4. Equipment will be Gradall for moving materials and removing debris, backhoe or babcat as needed for debris removal and dump trucks for removal of debris.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase (Corresponds to Figure 5)</th>
<th>Project Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1                                           | Remove wood timbers and bolts from boardwalk; remove timbers from upper deck areas and face of flood wall.  
|                                             | Remove canopies, ramps, guardrails, planters, and benches (to be reclaimed).  
|                                             | Raise utility vaults and cut in planters.  
|                                             | Install new stamped concrete on boardwalk and wood on upper deck areas and face of floodwall.  
|                                             | Install new canopies, seating benches, light fixtures, bollards, bike racks, and landscaping. |
| 2                                           | Remove wood timbers and bolts from boardwalk, remove timbers from upper deck areas face of flood walls.  
|                                             | Remove canopies, ramps, guardrails, planters and benches (to be reclaimed).  
|                                             | Raise utility vaults and cut in planters.  
|                                             | Install new stamped concrete on boardwalk and wood on upper deck areas and face of flood wall.  
|                                             | Install new canopies, seating benches, light fixtures, bollards, and landscaping.  
|                                             | Upgrade barge elevator shaft to meet current code adding new stop and landing.  
|                                             | Upgrade stairs to meet current code, remove deck boards, and waterproof top of barge  
|                                             | Upgrade gangway to meet code by possibly installing handicap lift.  
|                                             | Replace deck boards and stair treads. Repair Roof and siding on exterior of elevator shaft.  
| 3                                           | Remove wood timbers and bolts from boardwalk, remove timbers from face of flood wall.  
|                                             | Remove canopy, guardrails, planters, and benches (to be reclaimed).  
|                                             | Raise utility vaults and cut in planters, install new stamped concrete on boardwalk.  
|                                             | Install new timbers on face of floodwall.  
|                                             | Install new canopy, seating benches, light fixtures, bollards, bike racks, and landscaping. |
| 4                                           | Remove wood timbers from boardwalk and face of flood wall.  
|                                             | Remove Hornblower Building.  
|                                             | Raise the area in front of Joe’s Crab Shack.  
|                                             | Install new stamped concrete, light fixtures, bollards, timbers on face of flood wall, and guard rail. |
| 5                                           | Remove wood timbers from boardwalk and face of flood wall.  
|                                             | Raise the area in front of Joe’s Crab Shack.  
|                                             | Install new stamped concrete, light fixtures, bollards, timbers on face of flood wall, and guard rail. |
| 6                                           | Place new timbers over existing timbers. |
1. All construction material will be staged at the park and relocated between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. to the areas of work with spotter escorting equipment.
2. The Construction Trailer will be located between the restrooms and the railroad tracks. There will only be minimal parking spaces available for trailer staff.
3. Construction hours will be from 7am to 3:30pm.
4. Equipment will be Gradall for moving materials and removing debris, backhoe or bobcat as needed for debris removal, and dump trucks for debris removal.
Table 2. Project Phase 2, Construction Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase (Corresponds to Figure 5)</th>
<th>Project Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7                                           | • Install scaffolding under Steamers to add new maintenance platform.  
• Construct supporting structure for platform.  
• Install new platform and railing.  
• Install scaffolding under existing pier.  
• Relocate existing water line to flood wall.  
• Remove existing pier. |
| 8                                           | • Remove two trees and the existing bicycle path’s asphalt concrete pavement.  
• Install new subgrade and lay new asphalt concrete pavement. |

Table 3. Typical Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Equipment</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haul/Dump Trucks</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Trucks</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Trucks</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staging, Storage, and Truck Access

Staging, storage, and truck access would be the same for both Project phases. The staging area, which would contain all construction material, would be located at the park/open space area in between the railroad tracks and Front Street, across from Rio City Café. A construction trailer would be located between the restrooms and railroad tracks. All construction material and equipment would be moved to the construction work areas between 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. daily and escorted by spotters. For delivery of equipment and materials to the staging area, trucks would travel from 2nd Street onto Neasham Circle and then to Front Street. Construction of the Proposed Project will be coordinated with construction of the I-5 Riverfront Reconnection Project to avoid conflicts with construction site access and circulation, particularly along 2nd Street.
Public Access during Construction

A City-approved temporary traffic control plan will be provided for both phases of construction to ensure bicyclist, pedestrian and driver safety, and minimize access disruptions. Components of the access plan would include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Alternate routes will be established that replicates as nearly as practical the existing route.
- Use of directional signage.
- Protective barriers will be used to prevent public access into the construction area.
- Public notification prior to construction.
- Use of flaggers or other measures to direct traffic as needed.

Proposed Project Measures

Several measures are proposed as part of the Project to minimize potential environmental impacts. These measures are required by federal, state, and local regulations and will be implemented during construction to ensure compliance with agency regulations.

AIR QUALITY

As required by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the proposed Project will include applicable SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (including low vehicle speeds, limited equipment idling, etc.) to ensure that construction activity emissions are low. These measures are outlined in SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and requirements of SMAQMD Rule 403 during construction activities. Measures to be implemented include the following:

- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All areas to be paved should be completed as soon as possible.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by CCR Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]
- Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Maintain all equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer’s specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.
- Cover or maintain at least 2 feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible track-out mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

WATER QUALITY

Contractor is not required to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) will be implemented to identify potential stormwater pollution risks and specify corresponding Best Management Practices (BMPs). The WPCP will include BMPs identified as appropriate from the City's Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control (City of Sacramento
2013), and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan BMPs. BMPs may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Scheduling construction activities to minimize soil exposure during the rainy season
- Maintenance and monitoring of procedural and physical BMPs such as:
  - storm drain protection
  - rolled erosion control products
  - silt fence
  - sediment traps
  - stabilized construction entrance/exit
- Implementation of Good Housekeeping/Material Management measures such as:
  - concrete wash out areas
  - dust control
  - materials and equipment maintenance
  - spill prevention and containment
  - stockpile management

**Environmental Review and Potential Permits and Approvals**

The following permits and approvals are anticipated for the proposed Project (Table 4).
### Table 4. Anticipated Permits and Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Regulatory Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Clean Water Act (CWA) §404/Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10 Permit | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | All structures and work in and over navigable waters requires permit authorization. Structures or work outside the limits of navigable waters may also require permit authorization if the structure or work affects the course, location, or condition of the waters. This includes dredging, piers, floats, pilings, ramps, fills, overhead transmission lines, bank protection, and any other permanent, or semi-permanent obstacles or obstructions. | • Phase 1 requires a Notification.  
• Phase 2 (in-near-water work) requires a 404/10 permit. Project construction of maintenance platform and removal of pier, including temporary in-water work and scaffolding, and existing bike path upgrades, specifically the excavation into the riverbank to construct a wall footing, would require a permit if work occurs within the ordinary high water mark or could affect the condition of the waters. |
| CWA §401 Permit | Regional Water Quality Control Board | Any applicant for a federal license or permit that conducts activities, including construction of facilities that may result in any discharge into navigable waters shall provide the permitting agency a certification from the State. | • Phase 1 requires Notification.  
• Phase 2 requires a 401 permit for in-near-water activities. |
| State Fish and Game Code §1602, Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration | California Department of Fish and Wildlife | An entity may not substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake, or deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake without a 1602 Notification. | • Phase 1 requires Notification.  
• Phase 2 requires a 1602 permit for in-near-water activities. |
### Table 4. Anticipated Permits and Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Regulatory Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB)         | California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and CVFPB                           | The DWR and CVFPB oversee Project activities that may affect the management objectives related to flood control. Activities subject to this type of permit include any activity that would affect levees or the floodway within/between levees, or the designated floodway if no levees are present, within the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries. | • Phase 1 has received approval from the CVFPB.  
• Phase 2 will require an encroachment permit for in-near-water activities.                          |
| Historic Preservation Review for Public Projects      | City of Sacramento                                                                | Reviewed to meet requirements for Site Planning & Design Review for public projects in the Old Sacramento Historic District.                                                                                     | • Both phases will require discretionary review.                                                        |
| Construction/ Demolition Permit and other ministerial permits | City of Sacramento                                                                | Required to meet City regulations for construction and demolition, including best management practices for stormwater pollution control and minimizing dust emissions, and per City Code, including Title 17 Planning & Development Code. | • Both phases will require ministerial permits.                                                         |
SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES, ENERGY

Introduction

CEQA requires the Lead Agency to examine the effects of a project on the physical conditions that exist within the area that would be affected by the project. CEQA also requires a discussion of any inconsistency between a proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

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

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

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

Discussion

Land Use

The Project area is zoned by the City as a Central Business District (C-3) Commercial Zone with the area south of L Street and north of the Capitol Mall also having a Special Planning District designation. The areas north, south, and east of the Project Site are also zoned as Central Business District Commercial Zones with the area east of 3rd Street also having a having a Special Planning District designation. The Sacramento River is zoned by the City as part of the American River Parkway-Floodplain Zone (ARP-F). The City of Sacramento General Plan lists the Project area as Parks and Recreation with the area east of the railroad tracks listed as a Traditional Center with the surrounding area listed as a Central Business District.

The Project site is located in an urbanized portion of the community, within the Old Sacramento neighborhood of the Central City Community Plan Area. Development of the site as proposed would slightly alter the existing landscape for improved access and safety, but the Project site has been designated for both recreation and urban uses in the 2035 General Plan and the Planning and Development Code. Since the Project proposes only improvements to existing recreational and commercial uses it is consistent with these planning designations.

Agricultural Resources

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

The Project site does not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (NRCS 2010). The site is not zoned for agricultural uses, and there are no Williamson Act contracts that affect the Project site. No existing agricultural or timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the Project site. Development of the site would result in no impacts on agricultural resources.

**Energy**

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

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

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

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project is located on the Old Sacramento Riverfront Embarcadero, downtown in the City of Sacramento along the east bank of the Sacramento River between I Street and L Street (Figure 1). The waterfront area was redeveloped in the mid-twentieth century and has become the Old Sacramento Historic District, which was registered as a National Historic Landmark in 1966 by the National Park Service. Within the northern portion of the historic district are portions of the Sacramento Southern Railroad line, the State Railroad Museum, and the Old Sacramento State Historic Park. The Old Sacramento Historic District, including and surrounding the Project site, preserves the original riverfront railroad levee, the riverside scene, with the Delta King paddlewheel steamer, cobblestone streets, boardwalks, nineteenth century-styled architecture and many other historic elements. The general visual character of the site is one of urban historical development.

The 1.5-acre Project site is bordered by several riverfront businesses, including the Delta King Hotel, Joe’s Crab Shack, and Rio City Café. The Project site includes portions of the American Sacramento River Bike Trail and the entirety of the Old Sacramento Boardwalk, as well as the K Street Barge.

The existing boardwalk, constructed between 1984 and 1986, runs roughly north-south along the Sacramento riverfront and is constructed of exposed timber decking. The K Street Barge is docked between the Boardwalk and Delta King Hotel. The barge provides ramp, elevator, and stair access from the Boardwalk and features outdoor activity space, houses hotel operations, and maintenance functions.

The Sacramento River is considered a scenic vista and views are provided from the existing boardwalk, American Sacramento River Bike Trail, and restaurants and shops on the riverfront.

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

- The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the City of Sacramento, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2035 General Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.13, Visual Resources. A number of policies would reduce impacts to visual resources, light conditions, and glare conditions throughout the City as development occurs under the 2035 General Plan. These policies include: ER 7.1.1 requires protection of scenic views from public places to the Sacramento and American Rivers; ER 7.1.2 requires new development be located and designed to visually complement the natural environment/setting when near the Sacramento and American Rivers, and along streams; ER 7.1.3 requires that the obtrusive light be minimized by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary, and requiring light for development to be directed downward to minimize spill-over onto adjacent properties and reduce vertical glare; LU 2.2.3 requires new development along the Sacramento and American rivers to use the natural river environment as a key feature to guide the scale, design, and intensity of development, and to maximize visual and physical access to the rivers, subject to the public safety requirements; and CC. LU 1.1 which requires the City to improve the visual qualities of improvements.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for light and glare (Impact 4.13-1) and interference with an important scenic resource as viewed from a visually sensitive location (Impact 4.13-1) and concluded that impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR THAT APPLY TO PROJECT

The Master EIR did not identify mitigation measures for potential visual resources impacts since the policies of the 2035 General Plan will mitigate impacts to less-than-significant levels.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) Glare is caused by sunlight or artificial light reflecting from finished surfaces such as window glass, or other reflective materials. In general, glare is defined as a visual condition in which there is excessive contrast or an inappropriate distribution of light sources that disturbs the observer or limits the ability to distinguish details and objects. Glare is measured in terms of “luminance ratio,” which expresses the degree of contrast between bright foreground objects and a darker background and is subjectively referred to as brightness or light intensity. The absolute measurement of light intensity on a given surface is objective, but human perception of that light intensity as a source of actual glare is dependent on the size, position, distance, and degree of visibility of a source from a given vantage point; the number of sources in a given area; and the luminance, or light levels, to which the observer is adapted (i.e., background luminance).

Nighttime glare refers to direct, intense, focused light, as well as reflected light, and hampers visibility. Nighttime sources of glare could be created by particularly intense stationary sources, such as construction lighting. However, proposed hours of construction would be from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., which would eliminate potential nighttime glare impacts from construction activities. In addition, adherence with adopted City standards for construction, lighting would be installed at the lowest allowable height and would be screened and directed away from sensitive uses such as occupants of the Delta King Hotel. Therefore construction-related glare would be considered less than significant.
Daytime glare is typically caused by the reflection of sunlight from highly reflective surfaces at or above eye level, and is generally most pronounced during early morning and late afternoon hours when the sun is at a low angle. The Project would repair and replace several elements within the area, including the addition of galvanized corrugated metal roofing, which replaces the existing canvas canopies. In addition, repair at the existing barge elevator would involve replacement of existing wood shingles with galvanized corrugated metal roofing. The existing background luminance in the Project area is generally low, due to the lack of reflective building or landscape features. Although the new corrugated metal roofing would be galvanized, which would reduce some glare, the increased amount of glare that would still occur would be noticeable and could be considered an annoyance to visitors of Old Sacramento. However, increased glare from the roofing is not expected to create a public hazard. Impacts related to glare created from the new galvanized corrugated metal roofing is considered significant, but can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure AE-1.

B) The impact of nighttime lighting depends upon the type of use affected, the proximity to the affected use, the intensity of specific lighting, and the background or ambient level of the combined nighttime lighting. Nighttime ambient light levels may vary considerably depending upon the age, condition, and abundance of point-of-light sources present in a particular view. The use of exterior lighting for security and aesthetic illumination of architectural features may contribute substantially to ambient nighttime lighting conditions.

Nighttime light that spills outside its intended area can also be annoying to neighbors, motorists, cyclists, pedestrians, and could affect aspects of wildlife behavior in areas such as the Sacramento River. Nighttime lighting also illuminates the nighttime sky from below and can affect the viewing of the stars and other celestial bodies. Changes in nighttime lighting may become significant if a proposed project increases ambient lighting conditions beyond its property line and project lighting routinely spills over into adjacent light sensitive land use areas.

The Project proposes new light fixtures that consist of dark metal housing and fish hook crook-arm poles, which are simple in form and reflect the nineteenth century industrial and commercial themes of the area. Poles would be 12 feet high, and placed 20 to 25 feet apart on the east (land) side of the floodwall. Lighting would also be placed on the posts that are part of the shade structures on the elevated cantilevered sections of the Embarcadero. Light levels would substantially improve along the boardwalk for accessibility and safety.

Figure 7 displays the proposed lighting along the Embarcadero as viewed from the southeast. As shown, the proposed lighting is oriented downward to illuminate the boardwalk.
Although the Project would create an increase in the amount of nighttime lighting, light would not be cast outside the intended area. Potential impacts related to viewing dark skies and annoyance to surrounding land uses as well as wildlife along the river would not occur. In addition, in adherence with adopted City standards all proposed lighting would be limited to the amount required to safely light roadways, sidewalks, and pathways. Therefore the impact would be considered less than significant.

C) Old Sacramento preserves the original riverfront railroad levee and the riverside scene with the Delta King, cobblestone streets, boardwalks, nineteenth century-styled architecture and many other historic elements. The primary objective of the Project is to correct deficiencies related to accessibility and deferred maintenance at the Riverfront Embarcadero and at the K Street Barge. The Project would address concerns with the existing boardwalk related to the deterioration of the wood timber decking walking surface and floodwall, and would improve access and structural integrity of the K Street Barge that supports the Delta King. In addition, the Project includes streetscape improvements, including the rehabilitation of the Embarcadero canopies, placement of compatible lighting, bike path resurfacing and infrastructural streetscape enhancements, as well as plantings and small-scale landscape enhancements and improvements. The purpose of these improvements is to make the Old Sacramento Embarcadero and surrounding Historic District accessible and safe for residents and visitors to enjoy, while maintaining the physical and contextual integrity of the historic assemblage.

The Project would not degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings as the Project would not alter in an adverse manner any visual characteristics in the Project area and the proposed changes would not undermine any of the physical characteristics that convey the visual and historic significance of Old Sacramento. The Project would provide a compatible and sympathetic rehabilitation of key spatial and functional areas of the Old Sacramento Historic District and the Delta King. Therefore, no impact would occur related to degradation of the existing visual character of Old Sacramento.

MITIGATION MEASURE

Mitigation Measure AE-1. The proposed galvanized corrugated metal roofing of the Embarcadero canopies and the elevator barge structure shall be coated with a low- or non-reflective material to minimize daytime glare impacts. The material shall minimize glare to a level similar to that of the existing roofing, while maintaining visual and architectural consistency. The choice of material shall be coordinated with the City of Sacramento Preservation Director to ensure the roofing maintains and/or enhances the historic value of Old Sacramento.

FINDINGS

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to light and glare can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. AIR QUALITY**<br *

*Would the proposal:*<br *

A) Result in construction emissions of NOx above 85 pounds per day? |   |   | X |
| B) Result in operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day? |   |   | X |
| C) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |   |   | X |
| D) Result in PM10 concentrations equal to or greater than 5 percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard? |   |   | X |
| E) Result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 parts per million [ppm]) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm)? |   |   | X |
| F) Result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |   |   | X |
| G) Result in TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources? |   |   | X |
| H) Conflict with the Climate Action Plan? |   |   | X |

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

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

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

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

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

The closest air monitoring station to the Project site is located on T Street. As of 2014, Sacramento County is currently classified as in attainment for the state and federal ambient air quality standards for all pollutants except the state 8-hour ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM$_{10}$) standards (California Air Resources Board [CARB] 2014).

**Standards of Significance**

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

- Construction emissions of nitrous oxides (NO$_x$) above 85 pounds per day.
- Operational emissions of NO$_x$ or reactive organic gas (ROG) above 65 pounds per day.
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- PM$_{10}$ concentrations equal to or greater than 5 percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard. However, if project emissions of NO$_x$ and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, then the project would not result in violations of the PM$_{10}$ ambient air quality standards.
- Carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 parts per million [ppm]) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm).
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

A project is considered to have a significant effect relating to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions if it fails to satisfy the requirements of the City’s Climate Action Plan.

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

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2035 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.2.
Policies in the 2035 General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the 2035 General Plan. For example, Policy ER 6.1.1 calls for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the SMAQMD to meet state and federal air quality standards; Policy ER 6.1.2 requires the City to review proposed development projects to ensure that the projects incorporate feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions; Policy ER 6.1.4 and ER 6.1.11 calls for coordination of City efforts with SMAQMD; and Policy ER 6.1.15 requires the City to give preference to contractors using reduced-emission equipment.

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

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2035 General Plan that addressed GHG and climate change. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 4.14. The Master EIR is available for review at the offices of Development Services Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, California, during normal business hours, and is also available online at http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The proposed Project would generate short-term, temporary air quality emissions as a result of construction activities, such as removing structures, minor grading, and vehicle use. Less than 1 acre of land would be disturbed throughout both phases of the Project.

According to the SMAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines, construction projects that are 35 acres or less would not exceed 85 lbs/day NO\textsubscript{x} thresholds of significance and therefore emissions do not need to be calculated unless any of the following applies:

- Include buildings more than 4 stories tall.
- Include demolition activities.
- Include significant trenching activities.
- Have a construction schedule that is unusually compact, fast-paced, or involves more than 2 phases (i.e., grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coatings) occurring simultaneously.
- Involve cut-and-fill operations (moving earth with haul trucks and/or flattening or terracing hills).
- Require import or export of soil materials that will require a considerable amount of haul truck activity; and Chapter 3 Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions SMAQMD Page 3-5 of the CEQA Guide December 2009, Revised May 2011, April 2013, June 2013, and June 2014.
• Involve soil disturbance activity (i.e., grading) that exceeds 15 acres per day. Note that 15 acres is a screening level and shall not be used as a mitigation measure.

The Project proposes construction of improvements to existing facilities that would disturb less than 1 acre. No trenching is proposed, although potholes will be dug for the overhead light poles. This activity will be outside the levee prism. Removal of the one-story addition on the south side of the Steamers Building and other minor improvements would require some demolition. Other activities resulting in minor amounts of construction-related exhaust emissions would be generated by heavy-duty maintenance equipment, material delivery/haul trucks, and a small number of construction workers. Some site restoration/cleanup activities (i.e., repairing concrete and other surfaces, etc.) would also generate small amounts of ROG emissions. Construction would not be unusually fast paced or involve multiple phases occurring at the same time.

Based on discussion with the SMAQMD regarding this Project (Huss 2015), the amount of construction activity and ground disturbance would not trigger the need to conduct standard air quality emission modeling for typical construction-related projects. As these emissions would be temporary in nature, and would cease following the Project work, Project-related activities would not constitute a source of air quality emissions that would exceed the SMAQMD threshold of significance. In addition, as provided in the Project Description, the proposed Project will include applicable SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (including low vehicle speeds, limited equipment idling, etc.) to ensure that maintenance activity emissions are low. Therefore, since the Project would result in minimal construction-related air emissions, and standard construction emission control practices will be implemented as part of the Project, the proposed Project would not generate NOX emissions above the 85 lbs/day threshold. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

B) The proposed Project is a replacement and rehabilitation project that would not result in construction of development that would result in additional permanent or long-term air quality emissions. As such, the proposed Project would not result in operational emissions of NOx or ROG above 65 pounds per day. Therefore, no impact would occur related to stationary source operational emissions.

C) The SMAQMD has developed construction activity screening criteria and cumulative construction significance criteria for PM10 and PM2.5 (SMAQMD CEQA Guide, Chapter 3). If a project implements all SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and the maximum daily disturbed area (i.e., grading, excavation, cut and fill) of the project site would not exceed 15 acres (the proposed Project involves no ground excavation), then the project does not have the potential to exceed or contribute to the SMAQMD’s concentration-based thresholds of significance for PM10 and PM2.5 at an offsite location.

The Project would disturb less than 1 acre and implement standard construction emission control practices. In addition, the proposed Project’s construction vehicle and personnel trips are not anticipated to be so great as to substantially change (i.e., more than 5%) the mix of vehicles at affected intersections along travel routes to the Project site. The proposed Project would not generate traffic volumes that could cause CO hotspots at local intersections or adversely affect sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Project would not result in emission impacts that exceed California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and would not contribute substantially to existing or projected violations of a CAAQS. Accordingly, the Project would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds of significance for pollutant concentrations. The impact is considered less than significant.

D) Same as Answer “C” above.
E) Same as Answer “C” above.

F) Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the short-term generation of diesel particulate matter (PM) emissions from the use of diesel equipment required for moving materials, forklifts, and other construction-related equipment. Diesel PM has been classified as TAC by the CARB and exposure could have potential health impacts. Diesel PM emissions would vary depending on the types of activities occurring each day.

The dose at which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk; it is a function of both the concentration and duration of receptor exposure. Sensitive receptors in the Project area include local residents and visitors of Old Sacramento. Because the potential generation of TACs would be temporary and intermittent in nature and have a relatively low exposure period in combination with the dispersive properties of diesel PM, short-term construction activities would not result in the exposure of TAC concentrations that would exceed the established threshold of 10 in a million cancer risks. However, the proposed Project will include applicable SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (including low vehicle speeds, limited equipment idling, etc.) to ensure that construction emissions are low. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

The proposed Project also includes use of painting compounds and other hazardous materials that could be emitted into the air. Potential impacts associated with the use of hazardous materials such as these are described below in Section 10, Hazards.

G) Same as Answer “F” above.

H) The proposed Project does not include development of additional housing units or result in land uses that would generate additional sources of permanent or long-term GHG emissions. During construction, GHG emissions are associated with the operation of construction equipment and from construction worker trips. However, for construction of a project this size requiring relatively minor construction activity, the total carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions generated by construction are expected to be well below 1,100 metric tons per year of CO₂ equivalent. In addition, the Project proposes improvement to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, the use of which are City measures to reduce GHG emissions overall. Construction-related GHG emission increases would meet the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and the policies included in the 2035 General Plan that address GHG emissions and climate change.

The proposed Project would not result in any new land uses that could result in higher emissions of GHG than envisioned in the General Plan, and would not impede the City’s efforts to comply with AB 32 requirements. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the City’s Climate Action Plan and would not have any significant additional environmental effects relating to GHG emissions or climate change. The impact is considered less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Air Quality.
3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal:

A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?  
Effect will be studied in the EIR  
Effect can be mitigated to less than significant  
No additional significant environmental effect

B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal species?  
Effect will be studied in the EIR  
Effect can be mitigated to less than significant  
No additional significant environmental effect

C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?  
Effect will be studied in the EIR  
Effect can be mitigated to less than significant  
No additional significant environmental effect

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

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

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

Sensitive habitats include those vegetation communities which are considered rare within the region, are considered sensitive by the State of California, and are listed as sensitive under local conservation plans. Sensitive habitats within the region are usually associated with rivers, low gradient streams, floodplains, and occasionally ponds and canals. The Project area is adjacent to two sensitive habitats: the riverbank riparian corridor and the Sacramento River. In the vicinity of the Project, the Sacramento River is relatively confined (i.e., slightly wider than the river channel) between levees, which does not allow for any meandering of the channel over time. Riparian vegetation is present in the narrow bank between the water’s edge and the top of levee.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be significant if any of the following conditions or potential thereof, would result with implementation of the proposed project:
• Creation of a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected.

• Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal.

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

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

• Listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing).

• Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (or proposed for listing).

• Designated as endangered or rare, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (§1901).

• Designated as fully protected, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (§3511, 4700, or 5050).

• Designated as species of concern by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or as species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

• Plants or animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under CEQA.

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

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

Policies in the 2035 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2035 General Plan. Policy ER 2.1.5 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; Policy ER 2.1.10 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require preconstruction surveys when appropriate; and Policy ER 2.1.11 requires the City to coordinate its actions with those of the CDFW, USFWS, and other agencies in the protection of resources.

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

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

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

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

**ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS**

A) The Project consists of resurfacing the existing Old Sacramento Riverfront Boardwalk, improving accessibility features on the K Street Barge, a new maintenance platform, replacing pedestrian amenities and lighting along the Embarcadero, and improvement and widening of the existing bike trail. These replacement and rehabilitation features would not create new hazards to plant or animal communities on or adjacent to the proposed Project site. This impact would be less than significant.

B) The riparian corridor along the riverbank is highly disturbed and does not support sensitive habitat; however, there is potential nesting habitat for protected birds and roosting habitat for special-status bat species. During the site survey on June 25, 2015, cliff swallow nest colonies were observed under the cantilevered observation decks (Canopy D and Canopy E). No nests were observed under the cantilevered pier that is proposed as an option for removal. Cliff swallows return to the same nest colonies each year and will likely be present in the same areas next year. A mourning dove was also observed nesting above the boardwalk, under the eaves of Rio City Café.

The cantilevered sections of the Project area also provide potential roosting habitat for bats. Bats may also roost in unoccupied cliff swallow nests outside of the breeding bird season (Keeley and Tuttle 1999). The trees in the Project area also provide roosting habitat for some bat species. However, no bats or bat sign were observed during the survey. The Sacramento River does provide sensitive habitat for several special-status fish species.

**Aquatics.** Phase 2 of the Project proposes the removal of the cantilevered pier and construction of a new maintenance platform at Steamers. Both would require placing scaffolding within or near the river edge. The Project proposes use of specialized equipment including a debris containment system, which would use a barrier tarp or polyethylene plastic sheeting with vacuum function, and netting suspension under/around scaffolding; and recovery systems for sawdust, drill dust/slurry, such as hand drill dust collector. A water containment system would be established to ensure that contaminated water used to wash and clean surfaces is fully captured to prevent water contamination. In addition, implementation of water quality BMPs would further prevent impacts to the Sacramento River and special-status fish species. Refer to Section 6, Hydrology and Water Quality.
Nesting and Migratory Birds. The study area contains a number of ornamental trees and shrubs in the landscaping beds along the boardwalk area, streets, and buildings. Phase 2 of the Project involves the widening and resurfacing of the existing American Sacramento River Bike Trail. The Project is expected to result in removal of two mature London plane trees. However, based on discussion with the City Arborist, these trees are not considered Heritage Trees, as defined by the City of Sacramento (Dailey 2015).

The trees are large enough to provide valuable shelter and nesting habitat for a variety of resident and migratory bird species occurring in the region (e.g., scrub jay, white-crowned sparrow, Brewer’s blackbird, etc.). Given the highly urbanized nature of the surrounding area, it is likely that such landscape features are of value to these species as little other cover is available in urban environments. Although the species likely to use these trees are considered common and widespread, their active nests are afforded protection from removal by a variety of state and federal laws including California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, no nests were observed in the trees to be removed during the site survey conducted on June 25, 2015. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are present in the Project site. Foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk and white-tailed kite (e.g., grasslands with sufficient fossorial prey base) is not available in the Project area.

If construction occurs within the nesting season during Phase 1 or Phase 2, potential disturbance or loss of nesting birds protected under California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act could occur as a result of construction activity. This would be considered a significant impact, but with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 this impact to the known cliff swallow nest colonies would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by avoiding the nesting season. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce this impact to other birds that may potentially nest in the Project area by first identifying the presence or absence of active migratory bird nests, and if present, preventing the loss of eggs or young.

Bat Species. If special-status bats are roosting under the cantilevered sections within the Project area or in the two trees that are planned to be removed, potential disturbance or loss of roosting habitat could occur as a result of construction activity. This would be considered a significant impact, but with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by first identifying the presence or absence of roosting bats, and if present, preventing disturbance or loss of roosting habitat.

The Project could result in significant impacts related to protected species. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2 and BIO-3 impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

C) Aside from the Sacramento River, there are no other waters of the U.S. located within or directly adjacent to the Project site. As more fully described in the Air Quality and Hydrology and Water Quality Sections of this document, a variety of water quality, sediment/erosion control, and dust abatement measures are proposed as part of the Project that serve to minimize impacts to fish species and protect the water quality of the Sacramento River. Therefore, no additional significant environmental effects, over those identified in the Master EIR, on wetlands or other waters of the United States would occur as a result of the proposed Project. The impact would be less than significant.
MITIGATION MEASURES

**BIO-1:** To prevent impacts to the cliff swallow nest colonies observed during the site survey, work on the cantilevered sections shall occur outside of the nesting bird season (February 15 to August 31).

**BIO-2:** If work is scheduled to occur in other areas of the Project site during the nesting bird season (February 15 to August 31), a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted no more than 2 weeks prior to the start of work. If work ceases for 2 weeks or more, another nesting bird survey shall be conducted. Should an active bird nest be observed, no work shall occur within 250 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active.

**BIO-3:** A preconstruction bat survey shall be conducted to determine if bats are roosting under the cantilevered sections or in the two trees that are planned for removal. If roosting bats are found, appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures shall be developed based upon species of bat found and the area where the bats are found.

**FINDINGS**

All additional significant environmental effects of the Project relating to Biological Resources can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Adversely affect tribal cultural resources?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The City of Sacramento and the surrounding area are known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout the city. Human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric contexts. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources, as identified in the 2035 General Plan Background Report, are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses. According to geological maps, the surface of the surrounding area is composed of Late to Middle Pleistocene (11,700 to 781,000 years ago) Riverbank Formation. Artificial Fill is likely present in most if not all portions of the Project area since it has been previously developed.

Paleontological resources, or fossils, are the remains (such as bones, teeth, shells, leaves or wood) and/or traces (such as tracks or burrows) of prehistoric animal and plant life. Fossils provide evidence of ancient organisms and document the patterns of organic evolution and extinction. A formation or rock unit has paleontological sensitivity or the potential for scientifically significant paleontological resources if it has previously produced, or has lithologies conducive to the preservation of vertebrate fossils and associated or regionally uncommon invertebrate and plant fossils. All sedimentary rocks, except those younger than 11,000 years, certain extrusive volcanic rocks, and mildly metamorphosed rocks are considered to have potential for paleontological resources.

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

HISTORIC RESOURCES

A historical resources report was prepared to address potential impacts of the Project upon historical resources that are in and directly adjacent to the Project area (refer to Appendix B, Old Sacramento
Riverfront Embarcadero and K Street Barge Project, CEQA Historical Resources Impacts and Analysis).
Within the Project area, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed three resources: the Old Sacramento Historic District, a historical resource that is listed in the NRHP as a National Historic Landmark District (Reference Number 66000219, listed 1966); the Delta King, a moored river steamship that is listed in the NRHP (Reference Number 78000797, listed 1978); the J Street / Sterling Shipwreck, remnants of a river vessel located at the foot of J Street, also listed in the NRHP (Reference Number 91000562, listed 1991). In addition to their NRHP status, all three resources are listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), eligible as City of Sacramento Historic Resources, and historic resources for the purposes of the CEQA as codified in the criteria outlined in PRC §5024.1. In addition to the above three resources, California Historical Landmark Number 780, the site of the First Transcontinental Railroad, located adjacent to the Project area and is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

REGULATORY SETTING

CEQA states that it is the policy of the State of California to “take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with… historic environmental qualities…and preserve for future generations examples of the major periods of California history” (PRC §21001(b), (c)). Under the provisions of CEQA, “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (CCR Title 14(3) §15064.5(b)). CEQA §15064.5(a) defines a “historical resource” as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- Listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register; Listed in a local register of historical resources (as defined at PRC §5020.1(k)).
- Identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC §5024.1(g).
- Determined to be a historic resource by a project's lead agency (CCR Title 14(3) §15064.5(a)).

CEQA requires that historical resources and unique archaeological resources be taken into consideration during the CEQA planning process (CCR Title 14(3) §15064.5; PRC §21083.2). If feasible, adverse effects to the significance of historical resources must be avoided, or the effects mitigated (CCR Title 14(3) §15064.5(b)(4)). The significance of an historical resource is impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for the CRHR. If there is a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, the preparation of an EIR may be required (CCR Title 14(3) §15065(a)).

SACRAMENTO CITY CODE

In 2013, the Sacramento City Council adopted a new Title 17, Planning & Development Code, including Historic Preservation section, 17.604, of the Sacramento City Code. The purpose of Chapter 17.604 Historic Preservation of the City Code is:

- To establish a City preservation program, commission and staff, to implement the Preservation Element of the City's General Plan;
- To provide mechanisms, through surveys, nominations and other available means, to identify significant historic, prehistoric and cultural resources, structures, districts, sites, landscapes and properties within the city;
- To provide mechanisms and procedures to protect and encourage the preservation of the city’s historic and cultural resources; and
To provide standards, criteria and processes, consistent with State and Federal preservation standards and criteria, for the identification, protection and assistance in the preservation, maintenance and use of historic and cultural resources.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

The 2035 General Plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR 2.1.1), implementation of applicable laws and regulations (Policy HCR 2.1.2), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR 2.1.10) and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR 2.1.14). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort (Policy HCR 2.1.15).

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The Project consists of resurfacing the existing Old Sacramento Riverfront Boardwalk and bike path, improving accessibility features on the K Street Barge, a new maintenance platform, replacing pedestrian amenities along the Embarcadero, and the addition of new overhead lighting. All areas of Project construction have been previously disturbed by the development and restoration of Old Sacramento. The boardwalk construction in the 1980s was based upon several general, overview historical images, not necessarily detailed documentable images or plans, and hence would not be considered a historical reconstruction, though it does convey the historical sense of the old Riverfront Embarcadero. There are no known significant archaeological deposits within the Project area. Although highly unlikely, unknown and potentially significant buried resources could be inadvertently unearthed during construction. These deposits may constitute historical or unique archaeological resources under CEQA, in which case their destruction or disturbance would result in a significant impact. Therefore, although unlikely, the Project could impact unknown archaeological and paleontological resources, including human remains. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 potential impacts would be less than significant.

For historic resources, CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b)(3) indicates that a project that follows the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Project has been evaluated against the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Appendix B, Old Sacramento Riverfront
Embarcadero and K Street Barge Project, CEQA Historical Resources Impacts and Analysis). The analysis concludes that the Project would not cause any substantial adverse changes to the historical resources addressed as part of this Initial Study, as the Project would not alter in an adverse manner any of those physical characteristics of the resources that justify their inclusion or eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or the City of Sacramento Register of Historic Resources. The Project complies with The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and does not undermine any of the physical characteristics that convey the historical significance of the resources. Rather, the Project provides a historically compatible and sympathetic rehabilitation of a key spatial and functional area of the Old Sacramento Historic District, the Delta King, the interpretive sites of the First Transcontinental Railroad, and the J Street / Sterling Shipwreck.

While it is not anticipated that the Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to any historical resources, Mitigation Measure CULT-3 is required to prevent inadvertent damage during construction of both Project phases to the Old Sacramento Historic District, the Delta King Steamship, the J Street / Sterling Shipwreck, California Historical Landmark 780: the site of the First Transcontinental Railroad, or any other historical resources in the Project vicinity. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-3 potential impacts would be less than significant.

B) Same as Answer “A” above

C) Same as Answer “A” above

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

The following Project-specific mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to cultural resources.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-1:** Treatment of Previously Unidentified Archaeological Cultural Resources. If prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits are discovered during Project activities, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the archaeologist will assess the situation, consult with agencies as appropriate, and make recommendations regarding the treatment of the discovery. The City will contract with a qualified on-call archaeologist, meeting Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards, and with experience in underwater archaeology, shall be available as the project construction begins. Impacts to archaeological deposits shall be avoided by Project activities, but if such impacts cannot be avoided, the deposits shall be evaluated for their CRHR eligibility. If the deposit is not CRHR eligible, then no further protection of the finds are necessary. If the deposits are CRHR eligible, they shall be protected from Project-related impacts, or such impacts shall be mitigated, in consultation with the City’s Preservation Director, the State of California SHPO, Tribal representatives, as appropriate, and in accordance with State laws and regulations. Mitigation may consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, systematic recovery and analysis of archaeological deposits, recording the resource, preparation of a report of findings, and accessioning recovered archaeological materials at an appropriate curation facility. Public educational outreach may also be appropriate. This measure shall be enforced through its inclusion as a condition of approval for the Project and shall be in effect for the entirety of Project construction activities.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-2:** Treatment of Previously Unidentified Human Remains. If human remains are discovered during Project activities, they shall be treated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5. The Lead Agency shall inform its contractor(s) of the sensitivity of the Project area for human remains and verify that the following directive has been included in the appropriate contract documents:
“If human remains are encountered during Project activities, the Project shall comply with the requirements of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of Sacramento County has determined the manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation and consult with agencies as appropriate. Project personnel/construction workers shall not collect or move any human remains and associated materials. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission would identify a Native American Most Likely Descendant to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.”

Mitigation Measure CULT-3: Protection of Historical Resources.

- Project personnel working on the site will be briefed on the sensitivity of the adjacent historical resources.
- Heavy equipment and/or trucks will maintain adequate distance from built environment resources along the Embarcadero during Project activities to prevent inadvertent damage.
- No Project activities that could cause vibration of greater than .20 Peak Particle Velocity (inches per second) will take place within 100 feet of built environment resources on the Embarcadero. It is not anticipated that any such activities will be part of the proposed Project.
- Compliance and monitoring procedures will be established to avoid any inadvertent damage.
- The Project will consult with City of Sacramento qualified on-call archaeologist regarding protection of the J Street / Sterling Shipwreck under Phase 2 pier removal activities. Should these activities be found to have the potential to impact the wreck or associated features, Project plans will be adjusted to account for such impacts and, if necessary, underwater archaeologists will be engaged to mitigate identified impacts. It is anticipated that all scaffolding work will be done at low-water, with the scaffolding largely developed on dry land at the river bed edge, thereby avoiding unanticipated impacts. In addition, the Project will employ construction protections to prevent debris or cleaning/paint stripping agents from contaminating the site.
- While there are no known physical resources associated with California Historical Landmark Number 780: the site of the First Transcontinental Railroad, the Project will not alter the railroad associations and interpretive potential of the site by removing or materially altering any railroad-related elements or sites, including representative interpretive rails embedded in the Embarcadero, the alignment of the adjacent Sacramento Southern Railroad, which runs through the Old Sacramento State Historic Park, and California Historical Landmark Number 598, the site of the first stage and railroad, located at the northwest corner of K and Front Streets adjacent to the Project Area. By retaining all railroad features in the Project Area, the Project will maintain associations to the importance and ongoing development of railroad technology as a key element for interpretation.\(^a\)

\(^a\) The Sacramento Southern Railroad does not have status as a cultural resource; California Historical Landmark Number 598 has an OHP Status of 7L: State Historical Landmark 1-769 and Points of Historical Interest designated prior to January 1998, needs to be reevaluated using current standards.
In addition to the historical resources that are in or directly adjacent to the Project Area, there are several historical resources in the general Project vicinity including historical buildings along the east side of Front Street, the Tower Bridge, Hollow Sidewalks and raised streets and levees, Capitol Mall, and the Transcontinental Railroad Terminus. While the Project does not appear to have the potential to impact any of these resources, Project planners will monitor all Project activities for the potential for vicinity impacts. Should such impacts be identified, additional impacts analysis will be developed.

As part of their standard CEQA noticing procedure, the City of Sacramento will notice all potentially interested tribal representatives regarding Project activities.

**FINDINGS**

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

Would the project

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Allow a project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Sacramento is located in the Great Valley, which is approximately 50 miles wide and 400 miles long and located on a flat alluvial plain in the central portion of California. The Great Valley is bounded to the north by the Sacramento Valley, the drainage area of the Sacramento River and the Cascade Range; and, to the south by the San Joaquin Valley, the drainage area of the San Joaquin River and the Tehachapi Mountains. The Sierra Nevada mountain range and Coastal Range bound the eastern and western portions of the Great Valley, respectively.

Within the City of Sacramento and the Sacramento region, there are no known active faults. The greatest earthquake threat to the city comes from earthquakes along Northern California’s major faults, which are the San Andreas, Calaveras, and Hayward faults. Ground shaking on any of these faults could cause shaking within the City to an intensity of 5 to 6 moment magnitude (Mw). Sacramento’s seismic ground-shaking hazard is low, ranking among the lowest in the state. The City is in Seismic Zone 3; accordingly, any future development, rehabilitation, reuse, or possible change of use of a structure would be required to comply with all design standards applicable to Seismic Zone 3 (City of Sacramento 2014). The closest fault system, the Foothill Fault System, is approximately 23 miles east of the site and is considered potentially active. The Dunnigan Hills Fault is located about 24 miles northwest of the site and is not considered active.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The Project consists of resurfacing the existing Old Sacramento Riverfront Boardwalk and bike path, improving accessibility features on the K Street Barge, a new maintenance platform, replacing
pedestrian amenities along the Embarcadero, and the addition of new overhead lighting. Concrete work for the elevator upgrades, installation of maintenance platform, upgrading the bike path and installation of overhead lighting are the Project components that could be of concern during a seismic event. Based on an existing regulatory framework that addresses earthquake safety issues and requires adherence to City construction requirements and various design standards, seismically induced groundshaking and secondary effects would not be a substantial hazard on the Project site. In view of the above, the proposed Project would have no additional significant environmental effects, over those identified in the Master EIR, regarding exposing people or structures to damage resulting from strong seismic groundshaking. Impacts related to geology would be less than significant.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

**FINDINGS**

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

Would the project:

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY SETTING

The proposed Project site is located within and adjacent to the American Sacramento River Parkway, with a majority of the Project area not associated with the use of hazardous materials or uses. According to the State Water Resources Control Board and the California Department of Toxic Substances, the proposed Project is not on a list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code §65962.5.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) Soils contaminated with hazardous materials are not expected to be located on the proposed Project site. In addition, grading and excavation require a Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to be submitted and approved per Chapter 15.88 of the Municipal Code (Grading and Erosion and...
Sediment Control. Chapter 15.88 is used to regulate grading on property within the City of Sacramento to safeguard life, limb, health, property and the public welfare; to avoid pollution of watercourses with nutrients, sediments, or other materials generated by surface runoff from construction activities; to comply with the City’s NPDES Permit; and to ensure graded sites within the City comply with all applicable City standards and ordinances. Therefore, construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors are not anticipated to be impacted by contaminated soil encountered during Project construction activities. Impacts would be less than significant. No Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

B) Asbestos and Lead. Asbestos containing material (ACM) and lead based paint (LBP) are commonly found in structures that were built prior to 1979 and 1978, respectively. Phase 1 of the Project would require removing the one-story addition on the south façade of the Steamers building. This addition was built in the mid-1980s and therefore, construction materials used most likely would not have contained ACM or LBP. Impacts related to ACM and LBP are expected to be less than significant.

Treated Wood Waste. The boardwalk timbers to be removed during Phase 1 of the Project are assumed to contain hazardous materials due to the preserving chemicals that protect the wood from insects and fungal decay during its use. This treated wood waste (TWW) contains arsenic, chromium, copper, creosote, and pentachlorophenol, which are chemicals added to preserve wood. These chemicals are known to be toxic or carcinogenic. Harmful exposure to these chemicals may result from dermal contact with TWW, or from inhalation or ingestion of TWW particulate.

Because TWW contains hazardous chemicals, at elevated levels it is subject to California’s Hazardous Waste Control Law. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control has developed alternative management standards (AMS) for TWW that are based upon full hazardous waste requirements but are adjusted for the unique circumstances associated with TWW. The AMS (CCR Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 34) lessen storage requirements, extend accumulation periods, allow shipments without a hazardous waste manifest and a hazardous waste hauler, and allow disposal at specific nonhazardous waste landfills. The AMS simplify and facilitate the safe and economical disposal of TWW. These standards allow generators of TWW to presume their TWW is hazardous waste and avoid expensive laboratory testing. Generators can then manage their waste in accordance with the AMS, including disposal at certain nonhazardous waste landfills that are an approved composite-lined solid waste facility. Upon acceptance at these certain landfills, the TWW, at that point, becomes nonhazardous waste pursuant to Health and Safety Code §25150.8. The City is required to comply with AMS for TWW as well as applicable OSHA safety standards and regulations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

C) The Project does not propose any dewatering activities. Therefore impacts related to exposing people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities would not occur. Therefore, there would be no impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

FINDINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

The Sacramento River has many contributing tributaries upstream from the Sacramento Valley and flows southwest into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Sacramento River is the dominant source of fresh water and sediment to the Delta.

The water quality of the Sacramento River is generally good to excellent, with relatively cool water temperatures, low biological oxygen demand, medium to high dissolved oxygen, and low mineral and nutrient content. The Sacramento River receives agricultural drainage that fluctuates seasonally; contains elevated levels of pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer residues; and contains increased levels of sediment. Trace metal and synthetic organic compounds, some of which are potentially toxic, are found in sediments and fish tissues throughout the main stem of the river. Sources of these pollutants include historical and current practices, such as abandoned mining sites and industrial and municipal point-source discharges; and various nonpoint-source discharges, such as urban runoff and agricultural drainage return flows.

The Project area west of the floodwall (e.g., the river) is in Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Zone AE (area is subject to inundation by the one percent-annual-chance flood event), while the area east of the floodwall is Zone X (areas determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain). The proposed Project would be constructed within both flood zones, as mapped in the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Community-Panel Number 06067C0160H (FEMA 2015).

### Standards of Significance

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

- Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan.
- Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS UNDER THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR AND APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) Construction activities during both phases of the Project (e.g., grading) could expose soil to increased rates of erosion, which could result in increased deposition of sediments, potentially degrading receiving water quality. Another potential source of water quality degradation during Project construction is the inadvertent release of petroleum-based fluids and/or heavy metals used in heavy equipment. Construction projects are required to comply with the City's Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control (October 2013), and with the City's NPDES permit, including SPCC. Both of these regulations require that the City employ BMPs before, during, and after construction.

Construction projects disturbing greater than 1 acre require implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). However, since the Project would disturb less than 1 acre, a SWPPP is not required. Although an NPDES permit from RWQCB is not required, a WPCP will be implemented to identify potential stormwater pollution risks and specify corresponding BMPs. As provided in the Project Description, the City will implement the Project WPCP, which will include BMPs identified as appropriate from the City's Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control. BMPs may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Scheduling construction activities to minimize soil exposure during the rainy season
- Maintenance and monitoring of procedural and physical BMPs such as:
  - storm drain protection
  - rolled erosion control products
  - silt fence
  - sediment traps
  - stabilized construction entrance/exit
- Implementation of Good Housekeeping/Material Management measures such as:
  - concrete wash out areas
  - dust control
  - materials and equipment maintenance
  - spill prevention and containment
  - stockpile management

Compliance with the Project WPCP would ensure impacts to surface waters would be minimized and no alteration of surface water quality would occur. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
B) Implementation of some Project components would occur within or near the Sacramento River, which FEMA has designated as a flood zone. Phase 1 of the Project includes removing and replacing the existing wood decking, replacing the existing wood fascia boards on both sides and top of the existing flood wall, repair of the existing barge elevator, the addition of lighting, and repair and replacement of stairs, railings, wood overlay on cantilevered pier sections. In addition, a new intermediate elevator stop and landing would be added midway between the barge level and upper level that connects to the gangway from the Embarcadero. The elevator enclosure would be modified to add the required opening. The landing at the new stop would be connected directly to the Delta King by a new walkway. This structure would float with the level of the river water and would be built in conformance with the California Building Code, safety standards, and relevant permit requirements and would be designed to withstand storm event flows.

The Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) is the agency responsible for reviewing and permitting proposed work within a designated floodway. The CVFPB has reviewed Phase 1 and determined that these Project improvements are considered minor alterations and would not conflict with an adopted flood control plan or create injurious conditions related to flood protection. The CVFPB approved Phase 1, with conditions, and determined an encroachment permit would not be required (see Appendix C Central Valley Flood Protection Board letter). The Phase 1 conditions include the following:

- Access will be made available for flood patrol and stoplog installation, if necessary, during the flood season (November 1 to April 15).
- All work will conform to Title 23 standards.
- Project area will be restored to at least the same conditions that existed prior to start of work. Soil cuttings, grout washes, and debris resulting from drilling activates will be removed from site.
- The City will be responsible for any and all damages to the levee, floodway, and adjacent properties resulting from this Project.
- Appropriate agency notification will be conducted.

Phase 2 of the Project includes adding a maintenance platform on the river side of Steamers, widening and improvement of the American Sacramento River Bike Trail in the Project vicinity, and two pier options: remove the pier entirely or overlay the existing surface with new material and add a guard rail. Both the maintenance platform and the pier removal option would require that scaffolding be placed within or near the river’s edge. Scaffolding would extend approximately 20 feet from the building or pier and approximately 5 feet from both sides of the work area.

The bike path from the I Street Bridge downstream to the boardwalk is on the river side of the floodwall and needs upgrades to address safety and access issues. The upgrades include resurfacing, tree removal, widening, new guardrail, and removal of decorative wood beams, similar to the boardwalk area. This would require excavating in the riverbank to construct a footing for the wall and then back filling behind the wall. This footing would be located about 10 feet toward the river from the existing floodwall and about 2 feet lower than the base of the floodwall. The bike path upgrade would require removal of fill material and the placement of new fill in the floodway. However, there would be no excavation into the levee prism.

Phase 2 of the Project would require an encroachment permit from the CVFPB to ensure potential flood-related risks associated with the improvements would be minimized. The City is in the process of applying for the permit. It is anticipated that the permit will require conditions specifically addressing placement of scaffolding in the river and the removal and placement of new fill in the...
floodway. Anticipated conditions will likely include those as outlined above for Phase 1. In addition, other conditions could include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Construction of the maintenance platform and the option to remove the existing pier shall occur outside the flood season (November 1 to April 15).
- If construction must occur during flood season, at least 30 days prior to the start of any construction activities, the City will submit to the CVFPB Chief Engineer two sets of plans, specifications and supporting technical reports, if required, for any temporary in channel scaffolding that is to remain in the floodway during the flood season.
- Backfill material for excavations shall be placed in 4- to 6-inch layers and compacted to at least the density of the adjacent, firm, undisturbed material. Compaction shall be in compliance with ASTM D standards.

Prior to construction, the City must obtain all necessary permits. Compliance with Project-specific CVFPB permit requirements would ensure the Project would not result in creating flood hazards or conflict with any flood control plans. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant** with implementation of permit requirements.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures, beyond that required by permitting agencies, would be required.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Hydrology and Water Quality.
### Issues

**Effect will be studied in the EIR**  
**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant**  
**No additional significant environmental effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. **NOISE**

**Would the project:**

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

B) Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA $L_{dn}$ or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project?  

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

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

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

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

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Sound can be described in terms of amplitude (loudness) and frequency (pitch). The standard unit of sound amplitude measurement is the decibel (dB). The decibel scale is a logarithmic scale that describes the intensity of the pressure vibrations that make up a sound. The pitch of the sound is correlated to the frequency of the sound’s pressure vibration. Because humans are not equally sensitive to a given sound level at all frequencies, the A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) has been devised to specifically relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale does this by placing more importance on frequencies that are more noticeable to the human ear.

Noise is typically defined as unwanted sound. Typically, noise in any environment consists of a base of steady background noise made up of many distant and indistinguishable noise sources. Superimposed on this background noise is the sound from individual local sources. Several rating scales have been developed to analyze the adverse effect of noise on people. Since environmental noise fluctuates over time, these scales consider that the effect of noise upon people is largely dependent upon the volume of the noise, as well as the time of day when the noise occurs. Those that are applicable to this analysis are as follows:
• \( L_{eq} \), the equivalent energy noise level, is the average acoustic energy content of noise for a stated period of time. Thus, the \( L_{eq} \) of a time-varying noise and that of a steady noise are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear during exposure. For evaluating community impacts, this rating scale does not vary, regardless of whether the noise occurs during the day or the night.

• \( L_{dn} \), the day-night average level, is a 24-hour average \( L_{eq} \) with a 10 dBA weighting added to noise during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the nighttime.

• \( L_{\text{min}} \) is the minimum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.

• \( L_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.

SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

Some land uses are more sensitive to noise than others (sensitive receptors), and normally include residences, hospitals, churches, libraries, schools, and retirement homes. These uses are considered sensitive because they either depend on a quiet environment to serve their intended purpose, serve as a living space for people, or are institutional facilities with daytime and evening use.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

• Result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project’s noise level increases.

• Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA \( L_{dn} \) or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project.

• Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance.

• Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inch per second due to project construction.

• Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inch per second due to highway traffic and rail operations.

• Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inch per second due to project construction and highway traffic.

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The Project, once constructed, would not result in any new land uses or activities that could increase ambient noise levels. However, construction activities during all phases of construction would increase ambient noise levels on a temporary, intermittent basis while construction equipment is operating. Noise levels generated by construction equipment on site can greatly vary depending on the type of construction equipment used, specific model of construction equipment being used, the operation being performed by the machinery, and the condition of the equipment. Noise levels during construction activities also depend on the fraction of time that the equipment is operating over the period of construction, the amount construction equipment operating simultaneously, and the distance construction equipment is operating from nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, residential units, houses of worship, libraries, parks and recreational areas, etc.). The dominant source of noise from most construction equipment is generated by diesel engines without sufficient muffling devices.

Impact pile-driving or pavement-breaking are also noise-generating activities that can dominate a construction site.

Construction equipment on the Project site would operate under two conditions, either stationary or mobile. Stationary construction equipment operates in one location for one or more days at a fixed power operation (examples include pumps, generator, compressors that are not mobile and operate in one place). Mobile construction equipment, such as bulldozers, graders, loaders, and backhoes, move around a construction site and operate in a cyclic fashion; while, delivery trucks, concrete trucks, and haul trucks operate to and from the Project site. Table 5 shows the noise levels of typical equipment used in construction as measured from a distance of 50 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Representative Environmental Noise Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Outdoor Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet fly-over at 100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas lawnmower at 3 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel truck going 50 mph at 50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy urban area during daytime, gas lawnmower at 100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial area, heavy traffic at 300 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet urban area during daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet urban area during nighttime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Representative Environmental Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Outdoor Activities</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Common Indoor Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiet suburban area during nighttime</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Library, bedroom at night, concert Hall (background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet rural area during nighttime</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Broadcast/recording studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest threshold of human hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lowest threshold of human hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Sacramento, 2035 General Plan Update Technical Background Report, Chapter 7: Public Health and Safety; Table 7-2 Representative Environmental Noise Levels, pg. 7-43 August 2014.

Old Sacramento contains urban residential and semi-commercial areas. Daytime noise levels range between 55 to 60 dBA. A difference of 3 dBA is a barely perceptible increase to most people when evaluating changes in community noise levels; therefore, a 3 dBA increase over ambient noise level conditions in an area is typically used as a threshold in determining noise level increase impacts. A 5-dBA noise level increase is readily noticeable by the human ear, while an increase of 10 dBA would be perceived as a doubling of loudness to the human ear (City of Sacramento 2015a).

Construction of both Project phases would require the use of heavy equipment. Section 8.68.080(E) of the City Code requires that construction activities be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and public holidays. The Project proposes construction hours between 7:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, which is within the City’s restrictions.

Section 8.68.080(E) also requires the use of exhaust and intake silencers for internal combustion engines used during construction to reduce noise levels associated with construction activities. The City exempts noise associated with construction that occurs between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays because these hours are outside of the recognized sleep hours for residents and outside of evening and early morning hours and time periods where residents are most sensitive to exterior noise. Since the proposed Project would be within the construction time limitations of the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance, impacts associated with construction noise would be less than significant.

B) Same as Answer “A” above

C) Same as Answer “A” above

D) Ground vibrations from construction activities do not often reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can achieve the audible and feel-able ranges in buildings very close to the site. A possible exception is the case of fragile buildings, many of them old, where special care must be taken to avoid damage. The construction activities that typically generate the most severe vibrations are blasting and impact pile-driving. Construction of the Project would not require pile driving, blasting, or large bulldozers.

While it is not anticipated that the Project has the potential to cause damage to any historical resources, Mitigation Measure CULT-3 is required to prevent inadvertent damage from construction...
activity, including vibration. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, potential vibration impacts would be less than significant.

E) Same as Answer “D” above

F) Same as Answer “D” above

MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required other than those identified for the protection of historic resources (Mitigation Measure CULT-3).

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Noise.
Issues | Effect will be studied in the EIR | Effect can be mitigated to less than significant | No additional significant environmental effect
--- | --- | --- | ---
9. PUBLIC SERVICES
Would the project
A) Result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The proposed Project would not generate new population or land uses that would require additional or altered public services, including fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services. Therefore, there would be **no impact** on public services.

For impacts related to interference with emergency vehicles, refer to Section 10, Transportation and Circulation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

FINDINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. RECREATION</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong>) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong>) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2035 General Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

The Project site is located along the Sacramento River and within Old Sacramento, and includes the Delta King, American Sacramento River Bike Trail, and other areas intended for recreational use. The Project area is used by many pedestrians and bicyclists visiting Old Sacramento.

### Standards of Significance

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

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

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

Chapter 4.9 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2035 General Plan on the City's existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities, and recreational services. The general plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal ERC 2.1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees, or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities (Policy ERC 2.2.5). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2).

### Answers to Checklist Questions

A) The primary objective of the Project is to correct deficiencies related to accessibility and deferred maintenance at the Riverfront Embarcadero and at the K Street Barge, both of which provide recreational opportunities. The Project would address concerns with the existing boardwalk related to deterioration of the wood decking walking surface and floodwall, and would improve access and structural integrity of the K Street Barge that supports the Delta King. In addition, the Project includes streetscape improvements, including rehabilitation of the Embarcadero canopies, placement of compatible lighting, bike path resurfacing, and infrastructural streetscape enhancements, as well as plantings and small-scale landscape enhancements and improvements. The purpose of these improvements is to make the Old Sacramento Embarcadero and surrounding Historic District...
accessible and safe for residents and visitors to enjoy. Project improvements would increase access to the Delta King by repair of the barge and elevator, replace the boardwalk to meet safety standards, and enhance the American Sacramento River Bike Trail. Therefore, the Project would not cause or accelerate physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities, but would improve existing recreational facilities. **No impact** would occur.

For impacts related to public access to Old Sacramento and associated recreational facilities, see Section 10, Transportation and Circulation.

B) The proposed Project would not generate new population that could create the need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to the need for additional recreational resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

**FINDINGS**

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Recreation.
11. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

**Would the project:**

A) Roadway segments: degrade peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A, B, C, or D (without the project) to E or F (with project) or the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) Intersections: degrade peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or F (with project) or the LOS (without project) is E or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by 5 seconds or more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) Freeway facilities: off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp’s deceleration area or onto the freeway; project traffic increases that cause any ramp’s merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway’s level of service; project traffic increases that cause the freeway level of service to deteriorate beyond level of service threshold defined in the Caltrans Route Concept Report for the facility; or the expected ramp queue is greater than the storage capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) Transit: adversely affect public transit operations or fail to adequately provide for access to public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E) Bicycle facilities: adversely affect bicycle travel, bicycle paths, or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F) Pedestrians: adversely affect pedestrian travel, pedestrian paths, or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Effect will be studied in the EIR</th>
<th>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</th>
<th>No additional significant environmental effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

ROADWAYS

The regional roadway system serving the City of Sacramento includes major interstate highways and major freeways, including Interstate 5 (I-5) a north-south highway; Interstate 80 (I-80) an east-west highway; State Route 99 which runs north to south in California; and U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) that runs east to west. Local roadways in the City of Sacramento are classified as Arterial Streets, Collector Streets, and Local Streets.
• **Arterial Streets.** Arterial Streets provide mobility for high traffic volumes between various parts of the City and the region, serving a mix of through traffic and local traffic. Arterials typically link suburban and urban arterials. Suburban arterials generally have higher speeds and more access control. Urban arterials have generally lower speeds and less access control due to the intensity of the development in the urban environment. Arterials within the City of Sacramento may have up to eight travel lanes.

• **Collector Streets.** These provide for relatively short distance travel between and within neighborhoods, and generally have lower speeds and traffic volumes than arterials. Driveway access to collectors is less restricted than on arterials, but may still be discouraged. Collectors within the City may have up to four travel lanes.

• **Local Streets.** Local Streets provide direct roadway access to abutting land uses and serve short distance trips within neighborhoods. Traffic volumes and speed limits on local streets are low, and these roadways have no more than two travel lanes.

The following streets would be used during all construction phases of the Project:

• **Capitol Mall** connects the Project area to downtown Sacramento and provides access to the City of West Sacramento via the Tower Bridge. Two mixed-flow lanes are provided in each direction.

• **2nd Street** is a two-lane north-south roadway that extends from I Street to S Street with breaks at Capitol Mall and between P Street and Q Street.

• **Front Street** is a two-lane north-south roadway that extends from I Street to Broadway with a break south of Capitol Mall.

• **Neasham Circle** is a two-lane north-south roadway that connects 2nd Street to Front Street.

• **Truck Routes** provide access to the Project area. City-designated truck routes include 5th Street, I Street, and Capitol Mall.

**LEVEL OF SERVICE**

The level of service (LOS) of a roadway and intersection describes the operating conditions experienced by motorists. LOS is a quantitative measure of the effect of speed and travel, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, driving comfort, and convenience. LOS ranges from “A” as the best to “F” as the worst. Table 6 shows the number of lanes, existing average daily traffic volumes (ADTs), and LOS of the primary roadway segments in the Project vicinity. Table 7 shows the existing LOS and associated delay in seconds at intersections within the Project area. Table 8 shows the volume of traffic on freeway ramps that construction trucks would use to access the site.

**Table 6. Existing LOS of Roadway Segments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Volume ADTs</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Street – I-5/I-80 Business &amp; US 50 Interchange</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>173,300</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd. – J Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>179,300</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan Background Report Appendix D, 2014.
Table 7.  Existing LOS of Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing Delay (secs)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Street/Capitol Mall</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Street/Neasham Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Street/L Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street/L Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street/Neasham Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Sacramento, I-5 Riverfront Reconnection Project, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, July 2011.

Table 8.  Traffic Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Sacramento, I-5 Riverfront Reconnection Project, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, July 2011.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities.** Pedestrian facilities in the Project area include sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals, if present. Most of the streets in the Project area have sidewalks and most intersections controlled by a traffic signal have crosswalks. The 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan was last updated in March 2015. The plan identifies existing and planned bicycle trails and routes within the City. Within the Project area, the American Sacramento River Bike Trail runs through the Project site and provides the main bicycle access. Other bicycle routes include a Class III Bike Route along 2nd Street, a Class I Bike Path along K Street, and the Sacramento River Levee Bike Path/Jibboom Street accessing Front Street.

**Transit Facilities.** The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) provides the majority of the public transit service (light rail and bus) within the Project site, as shown in Figure 2. However, bus transit service is also provided by Yolobus, Folsom Stage Lines, Yuba-Sutter Transit, Solano Transit, Roseville Transit, El Dorado Transit, Elk Grove Transit (e-trans), and San Joaquin Regional Transit District. Train service is provided by Amtrak and the Capitol Corridor train service. Train service is provided at the Sacramento Valley Train Station at 4th Street and I Street. The closest RT light rail stations are at 7th Street and Capitol Mall, 8th Street and Capitol Mall, and on O Street between 7th Street and 9th Street. Light rail service extends from the City of Folsom to the Sacramento Valley Train Station and from...
Meadowview Road to Watt Avenue/I-80 (South Line). There is an extension of service under construction that would extend service to Richards Boulevard. Planning is underway to extend the South Line to Cosumnes River College and to construct a new line from downtown to the Sacramento International Airport by way of South and North Natomas.

**Parking.** Parking is a crucial component of the city’s transportation system. Parking is also an economic issue which is intimately connected to the vibrancy of commercial districts and small business, and is a key factor in the success of commercial uses. Parking in the Project area is provided on-street and within two parking structures.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts resulting from changes in transportation or circulation may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of general plan policies or mitigation from the 2035 General Plan Master EIR:

**ROADWAY SEGMENTS**

- Traffic generated by a project degrades peak period Level of Service (LOS) from A, B, C, or D (without the project) to E or F (with project).
- LOS (without project) is E or F, and project-generated traffic increases the Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C ratio) by 0.02 or more.

**INTERSECTIONS**

- Traffic generated by a project degrades peak period level of service from A, B, C or D (without project) to E or F (with project).
- LOS (without project) is E or F, and project-generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by 5 seconds or more.

**FREEWAY FACILITIES**

Caltrans considers the following to be significant impacts.

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

**TRANSIT**

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

**BICYCLE FACILITIES**

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

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

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

Transportation and circulation were discussed in the Master EIR in Chapter 4.12. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and aviation components. The analysis included consideration of roadway capacity and identification of levels of service, and effects of the 2035 General Plan on the public transportation system. Provisions of the 2035 General Plan that provide substantial guidance include Mobility Goal 1.1, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated, and maintained; promotes multimodal choices (Policy M 1.2.1); identifies level of service standards (Policy M 1.2.2), and supports state highway expansion and management consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Policy M 1.5.6) and development that encourages walking and biking (Policy LU 4.2.1).

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

The proposed Project would not conflict with the general plan's assumptions and conclusions regarding transportation facilities for the site in the Master EIR. The Project does not propose development that would result in more significant impacts to transportation than previously analyzed; and therefore, would not result in an individually minor, but collectively significant Project impact.

As required by CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(d), ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment, must be discussed. The proposed Project would not increase roadway capacity, extend transportation facilities to previously unserved areas, or make other improvements to the transportation system that could induce new growth. Therefore, the Project is not considered growth inducing.

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The Project consists of resurfacing the existing Old Sacramento Riverfront Boardwalk and bike path, improving accessibility features on the K Street Barge, a new maintenance platform, replacing pedestrian amenities along the Embarcadero, and addition of new overhead lighting. The proposed Project does not involve construction of residential or other land uses that would generate additional vehicle trips in the city or region.

Construction for Phase 1 of the Project is anticipated to begin late 2015 and end by summer of 2016. Construction for Phase 2 of the Project is anticipated to begin in 2017 and would occur over approximately a 1-month period; however, the construction start date would ultimately be determined by approval of the required agency permits. Construction worker vehicles and truck traffic would travel to and from the Project site using local roadways to access the Project site (Figure 6). For Phase 1, it is estimated that 102 truck trips would be required to haul debris out, and 138 truck-trips to deliver concrete and other construction material. For Phase 2, it is estimated that 4 truck-trips would be required to haul debris out and construction material to the Project site.
Staging, storage, and truck access would be the same for both Project phases. The staging area, which would contain all construction material, would be located at the park/open space area between the railroad tracks and Front Street, across from Rio City Café. A construction trailer would be located between the restrooms and railroad tracks. All construction material and equipment would be moved to the construction work areas between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. daily and escorted by spotters. For delivery of equipment and materials to the staging area, trucks would travel from 2nd Street onto Neasham Circle and then to Front Street. Construction of the proposed Project will be coordinated with construction of the I-5 Connector Project to avoid conflicts with construction site access and circulation, particularly along 2nd Street.

As provided in the Project Description, a City-approved construction traffic control plan will be implemented for both phases of construction to ensure bicyclist, pedestrian, and driver safety and minimize access disruptions. Components of the plan will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Alternate routes will be established that replicate the existing route as nearly as practical.
- Use of directional signage.
- Protective barriers will be used to prevent public access into the construction area.
- Public notification prior to construction.
- Use of flaggers or other measures to direct traffic as needed.

Construction truck traffic would access the staging area site on Front Street from Neasham Circle. As shown in Tables 7 and 8, intersections in the Project area currently operate at LOS A or B, and I-5 ramps operate at LOS B and F. Temporary construction workers (maximum of 16 workers in Phase 1 and 3 in Phase 2) associated with the proposed Project are assumed to come from the existing labor pool of residents in the Sacramento area and would generate approximately 20 to 30 average daily vehicle trips, which is fewer trips than would degrade peak hour roadway/intersection LOS or increase the roadway V/C ratio under current City standards. Thus, the number of trips that would be generated during construction of the proposed Project would be nominal and would occur on a temporary basis. Based on the nominal number of trips that would be generated during construction of the proposed Project, LOS at nearby roadway segments and intersections are expected to operate similar to that under existing conditions. Trips generated by the proposed Project during construction would not degrade the existing LOS ratings of the adjacent roadway segments and intersections that serve the Project site.

In addition, 2035 General Plan Policy M 1.2.2, allows LOS F conditions in the downtown Core Area if the project provides improvements to other parts of the citywide transportation system to improve transportation-systemwide roadway capacity, to make intersection improvements, or to enhance non-auto travel modes in furtherance of the general plan goals. The Project would enhance the pedestrian connectivity by providing improved pedestrian and bicycle access to the area.

The proposed Project would generate only short-term construction-related traffic and would not significantly contribute to existing traffic volumes or affect existing LOS in the vicinity. In addition, the Project would implement a construction traffic control plan to ensure bicyclist, pedestrian, and driver safety, and minimize access disruption impacts. Impacts would be less than significant and no Project-specific mitigation measures are needed.

B) Same as Answer “A” above
C) The proposed Project is immediately adjacent to I-5. Daily trips generated by the Project during construction activities would add to the vehicle volumes on north- and southbound I-5; however, the additional daily trips would not degrade existing LOS along this freeway facility. Also refer to the discussion under “A and B” above. Impacts would be less than significant.

D) Same as Answer “C” above

Except during construction, when temporary disruption of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities could occur, the Project would not affect existing or planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The proposed project would improve the ability for pedestrians to access the Sacramento River waterfront and would also provide improved bicycle parking. The improvements do not involve any changes to the roadway system. The proposed Project does not include new land uses or any modifications to the transit system and thus would not result in increases or decreases in transit ridership. For the above reasons, there would be no conflicts with transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

E) Same as Answer “D” above

F) Same as Answer “D” above

MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Transportation and Circulation.
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

Effect will be studied in the EIR
Effect can be mitigated to less than significant
No additional significant environmental effect

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

Effect will be studied in the EIR
Effect can be mitigated to less than significant
No additional significant environmental effect

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- Results in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project’s demand in addition to existing commitments.
- Requires or results in either construction of new utilities or expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) The proposed Project would not generate new population that could create the need for construction or expansion of utilities and service systems. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the need for utilities and service systems.

B) Same as Answer “A” above
MITIGATION MEASURES

No additional Project-specific mitigation measures would be required.

FINDINGS

The Project would have no additional Project-specific environmental effects relating to Utilities and Service Systems.
13. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

A.) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation

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.)

Effect can be mitigated to less than significant

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

No additional significant environmental effect

ANSWERS TO CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

A) As discussed in this Initial Study, the proposed Project has the potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources. Mitigation measures contained in this Initial Study would reduce these potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

B) As discussed in this Initial Study, the proposed Project has the potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources. The Master EIR identified that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would contribute to the loss of regional biological resources through the incremental conversion of habitat for special-status species to human use, and thus limit the availability and accessibility of remaining natural habitats to regional wildlife. However, terrestrial plant and wildlife habitat in Sacramento has been highly modified and is of relatively low quality due to its urban nature. Implementation of Master EIR Mitigation Measures and the Project-specific mitigation measures described above would ensure that impacts to biological resources would be minimized resulting in a less-than-considerable contribution to the region-wide loss of these resources.

For cultural resources, the Master EIR stated that future development in Sacramento under the 2035 General Plan, as well as within the larger region, could include excavation and grading that could potentially impact the archaeological resources and human remains that may be present. However, the mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study would minimize these impacts and preserve any
potential archaeological resources resulting in a less-than-considerable contribution to the region-wide loss of these resources.

Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazards and hazardous materials on a project-by-project basis would be required for all projects within the region, including the 2035 General Plan Policy Area. Additionally, site-specific investigations would be conducted at all future development sites within the Policy Area to determine impacts and need for mitigation. The proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative biological, cultural resource, or hazards impacts above those identified in the Master EIR. All other impacts are considered less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

C) As stated above, the proposed Project has the potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources. These impacts are not of a nature that could adversely affect humans; therefore, this impact is less than significant. However, the proposed Project also has the potential for impacts associated with hazardous materials, water quality, and transportation-related safety. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to these impacts would be required for all projects within the region. In addition, there are several proposed measures specific to the Project that will be implemented. Compliance with regulatory requirements, including proposed Project measures, and mitigation measures contained in this Initial Study would reduce these potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.
### SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Marked As Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V - DETERMINATION

ON THE BASIS OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

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

Scott Johnson

Signature

January 4, 2016
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Date

3-18-16

Revised Date
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