ADDENDUM TO AN ADOPTED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

Temporary Storage Yard – Vinci Avenue (DR20-025)

The proposed project consists of an approximately 30,000 square-foot temporary storage yard within an approximately 3.2-acre parcel in the Light Industrial Zone (M-1(S)-R). A future phase of the project will include a lot split, and development of a 14,945 s.f. office/warehouse building on each of the parcels totaling 29,890 s.f. A 5,000 s.f. shop with a 3,000 s.f. canopy will be constructed on one of the sites.

The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, as identified in the attached addendum, would have a significant effect on the environmental beyond that which was evaluated in the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). A Subsequent MND is not required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et. Seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Addendum to an adopted MND has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15164 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, Planning Division, 300 Richards Boulevard, Sacramento, California 95811 and is available online at http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports.aspx.

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

Date: July 13, 2020

By: Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
File Number/Project Name: Temporary Storage Yard – Vinci Avenue / DR20-025

Project Location: 1431 Vinci Avenue. (APN: 215-0230-041)


Project Background: On August 26, 2004 the City Planning Commission adopted a mitigated negative declaration and approved Vinci Trailer Supply Warehouse project that described the development of a 62,500 square-foot warehouse on approximately 3.7+ -acre parcel directly to the south of the subject site across the street from the subject site (APN: 215-0250-033). The two sites share the same physical characteristics and environmental issues.

Project Description: The proposed project consists of an approximately 30,000 square-foot temporary storage yard within an approximately 3.2-acre parcel in the Light Industrial Zone (M-1(S)-R). A future phase of the project will include a lot split, and development of a 14,945 s.f. office/warehouse building on each of the parcels totaling 29,890 s.f. A 5,000 s.f. shop with a 3,000 s.f. canopy will be constructed on one of the sites.

Discussion

An Addendum to an adopted mitigated negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are required, and none of the circumstances identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 are present. The following identifies the standards set forth in section 15162 as they relate to the project.

1. No substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

The original Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the effects of developing an approximately 62,500 square foot warehouse building and paving on a vacant 3.78-acre parcel. The subject project proposes at buildout the construction of approximately 35,000 square feet of building and paving on a 3.2-acre vacant parcel. Construction, drainage and other City standard requirements would be applicable as in the original project. Both parcels are adjacent to the Magpie Creek diversion, and mitigation for potential impacts due to vegetation associated with this feature are included in both the original and current project.

The proposed development is smaller in size than the previously approved project but the physical characteristics and development requirements of the sites are similar. Potential impacts of the original project for Air Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources were identified, and mitigation measures were adopted to reduce all impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not result in new significant effects or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified effects. Mitigation measures have been updated for biological resources based on a current biological resources survey. All remaining applicable mitigation
measures identified for the original project would be implemented with the proposed development.

2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require major revisions of the previous MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effect or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Several changes have occurred since the MND and addendum were approved, including the adoption of the 2030 and updated 2035 General Plan and associated Master EIRs, and the guidelines and modeling techniques for evaluating air quality emissions.

The proposed project is consistent with the updated and current 2035 General Plan and would not require any land use amendments. The project-specific impacts of the project that were not evaluated in the Master EIR have been identified, mitigation adopted and such impacts have been reduced to a less-than-significant level.

There have been some changes in regards to evaluating impacts related to air quality since the original project approval including the adoption and revisions of the Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County and the modeling tools used in evaluation. These changes do not affect the environmental assessment. The size of the project and the proposed square footage of the office, warehouse, and shop areas do not create any new or increase the air quality impacts associated with the project.

The proposed project would not require major revisions of the adopted MND due to the involvement of a new significant environmental effect or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As stated above, mitigation measures for biological resources have been revised and updated based upon current information and will be implemented to address potential effects of the proposed project.

3. No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous MND was certified as complete or adopted, shows any of the following:

   a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous MND;

   b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous MND;

   c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, or;

   d) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerable different from those analyzed in the previous would substantially reduce on or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
Substantial changes are not proposed as the development of the subject site will be similar to the development of the original site, nor have any substantial changes occurred that would require major revisions to the adopted mitigated negative declaration for the purpose of providing adequate environmental review for the Temporary Storage Yard – Vinci Avenue project. The proposed project modifications would not result in any new information of substantial importance that would have new or more severe impacts from what was identified for the original project MND. Mitigation measures for biological resources have been revised and updated based upon current information and will be implemented to address potential effects of the proposed project. The updated mitigation measures are of equal or more effective value at reducing the effects of the subject project.

Based on the above analysis, this Addendum to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project has been prepared.

Attachments:

A) Vicinity Map
B) Site Plan
C) Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan
D) Mitigated Negative Declaration for Vinci Avenue Warehouse (P04-011)
TEMPORARY STORAGE YARD – VINCI AVE (DR20-025)
MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) has been required by and prepared for the City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department, Environmental Planning Services, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21081.6.

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Name / File Number: Temporary Storage Yard – Vinci Avenue (DR20-025)
Owner/Developer- Name: Robert A. Bothman Construction, Mike Quatman
Address: 2690 Scott Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Project Location / Legal Description of Property (if recorded):
The proposed project is located at 1431 Vinci Avenue in the North Sacramento Community Plan area of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County (APN: 215-0230-041).

Project Description:
The project consists of an approximately 30,000 square-foot temporary storage yard within an approximately 3.2-acre parcel in the Light Industrial Zone (M-1(S)-R). A future phase of the project will include a lot split, and development of a 14,945 s.f. office/warehouse building on each of the parcels totaling 29,890 s.f. Additionally, on one of the future parcels a 5,000 s.f. shop with a 3,000 s.f. canopy will be constructed.

SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

The Plan includes mitigation for Air Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources. The intent of the Plan is to prescribe and enforce a means for properly and successfully implementing the mitigation measures as identified within the Initial Study for this project. Unless otherwise noted, the cost of implementing the mitigation measures as prescribed by this Plan shall be funded by the owner/developer identified above. This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) is designed to aid the City of Sacramento in its implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures adopted for the proposed project.

The mitigation measures have been taken from the Initial Study and are assigned the same number they have in the document. The MMP describes the actions that must take place to implement each mitigation measure, the timing of those actions, and the entities responsible for implementing and monitoring the actions. The developer will be responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures contained with the MMP. The City of Sacramento will be responsible for ensuring compliance.
### TEMPORARY STORAGE YARD – VINCI AVENUE (DR20-025)
**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN**

#### VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Compliance Standards</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Air Quality:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1. The contractor/developer shall maintain all equipment in proper running condition per the manufacturer’s specifications.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Community Development Department and SMAQMD</td>
<td>Note shall be included on the Map and within the Standard Construction Specifications</td>
<td>Measures shall be implemented in field during grading and construction activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-1. <strong>Prepare a Spill Prevention Plan.</strong> A spill prevention plan will be prepared and will describe the measures to be taken to minimize the risk that fluids or other materials used during construction (e.g., oils, transmission and hydraulic fluids, cement, and fuel) would enter the MCDC or contaminate adjacent riparian areas. A cleanup protocol will also be developed before construction begins and will be implemented in the event of a spill.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td>Mitigation measures including pre-construction biological surveys shall shown on construction plans and shall be completed prior to issuance of grading permits and shall be submitted with grading/building plans.</td>
<td>The Community Development Department shall assure that measures are identified on construction plans and confirm compliance prior to issuance of any grading or building permit. Measures shall be implemented prior to issuance of grading permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-2. <strong>Store Equipment and Materials in Designated Staging Areas.</strong> Stockpiling of materials, including portable equipment, vehicles, and supplies (e.g., chemicals), will be restricted to the designated construction staging areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-3. If native nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 are determined to be present, impacts on these species will be avoided by conducting project activities that involve clearing vegetation, generating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEMPORARY STORAGE YARD – VINCI AVENUE (DR20-025)
#### MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

#### VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Compliance Standards</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mechanical noise, or causing ground disturbance outside the typical breeding season (February 1 to September 1) to the extent feasible. BR-4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td>The Community Development Department shall assure that measures are identified on construction plans and confirm compliance prior to issuance of any grading or building permit. Mitigation measures including pre-construction biological surveys shall be completed prior to issuance of grading permits and shall be submitted with grading/building plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If project activities must be conducted during the nesting bird season, surveys will be conducted for nesting birds within a 1,000-foot radius of the construction area. If nests are detected, buffers that are sufficient to ensure that breeding is not likely to be disrupted or adversely affected by construction will be established around nests in consultation with the City of Sacramento and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Swainson’s hawk BR-5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW guidelines (CDFG 1994) state that no intensive new disturbances, such as heavy equipment operation associated with construction, should be initiated within 0.25 mile of an active Swainson’s hawk nest between March 1 and August 15 (the nesting season). If construction or other project related activities are necessary during the nesting season, surveys of known nests and appropriate nesting habitat shall be conducted within the project vicinity. If active nests are found and disturbances such as construction are to occur during the nesting season, then protective measures specified by CDFW which may include but not be limited to monitoring of the nest site (funded by the project sponsor) by a qualified biologist. White-tailed Kite BR-6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activity, including vegetation removal, will only occur outside the typical breeding season for raptors (September 16 to December 31), if raptors are determined to be present. BR-7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If construction occurs between February 1 and August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementing Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Compliance Standards</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-8. If potential nesting trees are to be removed during construction activities, removal will take place outside of the raptor nesting season</td>
<td>Community Development Department and CDFW</td>
<td>Mitigation measures including pre-construction biological surveys shall be completed prior to issuance of any grading or building permit. Measures shall be implemented prior to issuance of grading permits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Giant Garter Snake**

Consultation with the City of Sacramento, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and CDFW shall determine specific buffer distances and measures to avoid impacts on the giant garter snake and its habitat adjacent to the project site in the MCDC. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

BR-9. All construction activity involving disturbance of habitat, such as site preparation and initial grading, is restricted to the period between May 1 and September 30. This is the active period for the giant garter snake and direct mortality is lessened, because snakes are expected to

31, a qualified biologist will conduct surveys for nesting raptors in accordance with established CDFW survey protocols. Surveys will cover a minimum of a 0.5-mile radius around the construction area. If nesting raptors are detected, buffers (i.e., no-disturbance zones) that have been approved by CDFW in writing will be established around nests to ensure that breeding is not likely to be disrupted or adversely affected by construction. Buffers around active raptor nests will be 500 feet for non-listed raptors, unless a qualified biologist determines that smaller buffers would be sufficient to avoid impacts on nesting raptors. Factors to be considered for determining buffer width will include: the presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography; nest height; locations of foraging territory; and baseline levels of noise and human activity. Buffers will be maintained until a qualified biologist has determined that young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival.
### 11. Cultural Resources:

**CR-1.** If subsurface archaeological or historical remains are discovered during construction, work in the area shall stop immediately and a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Compliance Standards</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Initials/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actively move and avoid danger. BR-10. Fences will be constructed along the shared boundary of the project site and the MCDC in accordance with, but not limited to the following: a) A snake deterrent will be placed along the fence on the MCDC. The design of the deterrent shall be subject to approval by USFWS and CDFW. b) The specific fence/snake barrier design adjacent to the project site will be determined within the City of Sacramento’s review of the proposed project.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>issuance of grading permits and shall be submitted with grading/building plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cultural Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-2. If human burials are encountered, all work in the area shall stop immediately and the Sacramento County Coroner's office shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendants must be notified and recommendations for treatment solicited (CEQA Section 15064.5); Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and 5097.98.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

P04-011 Vinci Avenue Trailer Supply Warehouse project consists of various entitlements to construct a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone. Specific entitlements include:

A. Plan Review of a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone.

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

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

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

By: [Signature] 7/15/04
This Initial Study has been prepared by the Development Services Department, Environmental Planning Services, 1231 I Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814, pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code.

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

SECTION I. - BACKGROUND: Page 3 - Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, when the Initial Study was completed, and a project introduction.

SECTION II. - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Page 5 - Includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project.

SECTION III. - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Page 6 - Contains the Environmental Checklist form together with a discussion of the checklist questions. The Checklist Form is used to determine the following for the proposed project: 1) "Potentially Significant Impacts" that may not be mitigated with the inclusion of mitigation measures, 2) "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated" which could be mitigated with incorporation of mitigation measures, and 3) "Less-than-significant Impacts" which would be less-than-significant and do not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

SECTION IV. - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: Page 43 - Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have either a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated," as indicated in the Environmental Checklist.

SECTION V. - DETERMINATION: Page 44 - Identifies the determination of whether impacts associated with development of the Proposed Project are significant, and what, if any, additional environmental documentation may be required.

ATTACHMENTS: A – Vicinity Map/Location Map
              B -- Project Plans
SECTION I. BACKGROUND

File Number, Project Name:

P04-011, Vinci Avenue Trailer Supply Warehouse

Project Location:

1440 Vinci Avenue in the North Sacramento Community Plan area of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County. (APNs: 215-0250-033).

Project Applicant, Project Planner, and Environmental Planner Contact Information:

Project Applicant
Gary Roberts
1512 Fourteenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 498-7900

Project Planner
Michael York, Assistant Planner
City of Sacramento, Development Services Department
1231 I Street, Room 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 808-8239

Environmental Planner
Scott Johnson, Assistant Planner
City of Sacramento, Development Services Department
1231 I Street, Room 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 808-5842

Introduction

The proposed project consists of various entitlements to construct a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone.

The City of Sacramento, as lead agency, has determined that the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project is a Mitigated Negative Declaration. This environmental document examines project effects which are identified as potentially significant effects on the environment or which may be substantially reduced or avoided by the adoption of revisions or conditions to the design of project specific features. It is believed at this time that the project will not result in potentially significant impacts. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the proposed environmental document for this project.
The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 20-day review period ending, Wednesday, August 4, 2004.

Please send written responses to:

Scott Johnson, Environmental Project Manager
Development Services Department
Environmental Planning Services
1231 I Street, Ste. 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 264-7185
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
SECTION II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The project site is located at 1440 Vinci Avenue in the North Sacramento Community Plan area of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County (APNs: 251-0250-033).

Project Background

The project site is vacant and has been historically vacant. The area that encompasses the proposed project site has a North Sacramento Community Plan designation of Industrial.

Project Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to develop a wholesale trailer supply warehouse in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone.

Project Components

The proposed project consists of various entitlements to construct a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone. Specific entitlements include:

A. Plan Review of a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone.

REFERENCES (available at 1231 L Street, Room 300, Sacramento, CA 95814):
City of Sacramento. 1984 North Sacramento Community Plan
City of Sacramento. 1984. North Sacramento Community Plan DEIR
SMAQMD, 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook
SECTION III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND USE Would the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Affect agricultural resources or operation (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impact from incompatible land uses?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The City of Sacramento General Plan identifies the site as Heavy Commercial or Warehouse. The North Sacramento Community Plan identifies the site as Industrial. The site is zoned Light Industrial - Review (M-1S-R) zone.

The project site has is currently vacant and undeveloped. The area to the north consists of vacant land with a church structure to the northwest. The area to the immediate west is comprised of a 5± acre parcel which contains vehicles and other equipment scattered about the site and a single-family residence on the western side of the parcel. Farther to the west, is a mix of vacant land, industrial uses, and single-family residences. Sites to the east consist of the developed industrial uses. To the south are vacant parcels.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if the project would:

- Substantially change land use of the site;
- Be incompatible with long-term uses on adjacent properties; or
- Conflict with applicable land use plans.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

The proposed project consists of developing a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone. The proposed use is consistent with the designated
use as identified in the General Plan and North Sacramento Community Plan. Therefore, impacts to land use are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

The project site is not currently in agricultural use. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact on land use would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Findings**

The proposed project would not result in impacts to land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would the proposal:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The City of Sacramento General Plan identifies the site as Heavy Commercial or Warehouse. The North Sacramento Community Plan identifies the site as Industrial. The site is zoned Light Industrial - Review (M-1S-R) zone.

The project site has is currently vacant and undeveloped. The area to the north consists of vacant land with a church structure to the northwest. The area to the immediate west is comprised of 5± acre parcel contain a single-family residence on the western side of the parcel. Further to the west, is a mix of vacant land, industrial uses, and single-family residences. Sites to the east consist of the developed industrial uses. To the south are vacant parcels.

**Standards of Significance**

Section 15131 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that the
economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as a significant effect on the environment. However, CEQA indicates that social and economic effects be considered in an EIR only to the extent that they would result in secondary or indirect adverse impacts on the physical environment.

This environmental document does not treat population/housing as an environmental impact, but rather as a social-economic impact. If there are clear secondary impacts created by a population/housing increase generated by the project, those secondary impacts will be addressed in each affected area (e.g., transportation, air quality, etc).

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if the project would induce substantial growth that is inconsistent with the approved land use plan for the area or displace existing affordable housing.

**Answers to Checklist Questions**

**Questions A & B**

The proposed project consists of developing a 62,500± square foot warehouse on 3.78± acres in the Light Industrial Review (M-1S-R) zone. The proposed use is consistent with the designated use as identified in the General Plan and North Sacramento Community Plan. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on population and housing.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Finding**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to population and housing.
### 3. SEISMICITY, SOILS, AND GEOLOGY

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Seismic hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Subsidence of land (groundwater pumping or dewatering)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Unique geologic or physical features?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

**Seismicity.** The Sacramento General Plan Update (SGPU) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) identifies all of the City of Sacramento as being subject to potential damage from earthquake groundshaking at a maximum intensity of VIII of the Modified Mercalli scale (SGPU DEIR, 1987, T-16). No active or potentially active faults are known to cross within close proximity to the project site.

**Topography.** Terrain in the City of Sacramento features very little relief (SGPU, DEIR, 1987, T-3). The potential for slope instability within the City of Sacramento is minor due to the relatively flat topography of the area.

**Regional Geology.** The surface geology of the project site consists of Pleistocene Alluvium (Victor Formation). The Victor Formation forms a broad plain between the Sacramento River and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountains (SGPU DEIR, T-1). It is a complex mixture of consolidated, ancient river-borne sediments of all textures (SGPU DEIR, T-1). Weathering subsequent to formation during the Ice Ages has typically caused a hardpan layer to develop near the surface, generally allowing only a moderate-to-low rate of rainwater infiltration (SGPU DEIR, T-1).

The general soils of the area consist of San Joaquin, which are moderately deep, well-drained soils that are underlain by a cemented hardpan (SGPU DEIR, T-5).

**Standards of Significance**

For the purposes of this analysis, 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.
Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Cities in California are required to consider seismic safety as part of the General Plan safety elements. The City of Sacramento also recognizes that it is prudent for the City to prepare for seismic related hazards and has, therefore, adopted policies as a part of the General Plan, Health and Safety Element. These policies require that the City protect lives and property from unacceptable risk due to seismic and geologic activity or unstable soil conditions to the maximum extent feasible, that the City prohibit the construction of structures for permanent occupancy across faults, that soils reports and geologic investigations be required for multiple story buildings, and that the Uniform Building Code requirements that recognize State and Federal earthquake protection standards in construction be used. The policies listed above are implemented through the building permit for new construction projects and reduce the potential significant health and safety impacts. Thus, for the purposes of this environmental analysis, the potential for a significant geologic, soils, or seismic impact created by construction of the project has been substantially lessened by the use of regulatory requirements. Because the project must comply with these regulatory requirements, seismic hazards are considered to be less-than-significant.

Question B

Title 15, Chapter 15.88 of the City’s Municipal Code requires a grading permit be obtained prior to construction activities. In accordance with the grading permit requirements, the applicant must submit an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) plan to reduce the amount of erosion and retain sediment on the project site. In addition, the Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report indicates that there are no highly erodible soils within the City (T-13). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and geotechnical impacts related to erosion and soil loss would be less than significant.

Question C

According to the SGPU DEIR, no significant subsidence of land had occurred within the City of Sacramento (T-13). State regulations and standards related to geotechnical considerations are reflected in the Sacramento City Code. Construction and design would be required to comply with the latest City-adopted code at the time of construction, including the Uniform Building Code. The code would require construction and design of buildings to meet standards that would reduce risks associated with subsidence or liquefaction. Since the topography of the area is relatively flat, landslides do not present a hazard in the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

Question D

No unique geologic features exist in close proximity to the project. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts from or to unique geologic or natural features.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.
Findings
The proposed project would not have a significant impact on seismicity, soils, and geology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawal, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Impacts to groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

Drainage/Surface Water. Topography of the general vicinity is relatively flat with no swales. The site slopes slightly from the west to the east, and the lowest portion is against the maintenance road adjacent to the Magpie Creek Diversion. Drainage typically would occur by saturation or moderate surface flow to the lower portions of the site.
Water Quality. The City’s municipal water is received from the American River and Sacramento River. The water quality of the American River is considered very good. The Sacramento River water is considered to be of good quality, although higher sediment loads and extensive irrigated agriculture upstream of Sacramento tends to degrade the water quality. During the spring and fall, irrigation tailwaters are discharged into drainage canals that flow to the river. In the winter, runoff flows over these same areas. In both instances, flows are highly turbid and introduce large amounts of herbicides and pesticides into the drainage canals, particularly rice field herbicides in May and June. The aesthetic quality of the river is changed from relatively clear to turbid from irrigation discharges.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has primary responsibility for protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters within the City. The RWQCB’s efforts are generally focused on preventing either the introduction of new pollutants or an increase in the discharge of existing pollutants into bodies of water that fall under its jurisdiction.

The RWQCB is concerned with all potential sources of contamination that may reach both these subsurface water supplies and the rivers through direct surface runoff or infiltration. Storm water runoff is collected in City drainage facilities and is sent directly to the Sacramento River. RWQCB implements water quality standards and objectives that are in keeping with the State of California Standards.

The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board under the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in storm runoff. The general permit requires the permittee to employ BMPs before, during, and after construction. The primary objective of the BMPs is to reduce non-point source pollution into waterways. These practices include structural and source control measures for residential and commercial areas, and BMPs for construction sites. BMP mechanisms minimize erosion and sedimentation, and prevent pollutants such as oil and grease from entering the storm water drains. BMPs are approved by Department of Utilities before beginning construction (the BMP document is available from the Department of Utilities, Engineering Services Division, 1395 35th Avenue, Sacramento, CA). Components of BMPs include:

- Maintenance of structures and roads;
- Flood control management;
- Comprehensive development plans;
- Grading, erosion and sediment control ordinances;
- Inspection and enforcement procedures;
- Educational programs for toxic material management;
- Reduction of pesticide use; and
- Site-specific structural and non-structural control measures.

Flooding. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map revised as of July 6, 1998 indicates that the project site is within the Flood Zone X (un-shaded). Flood Zone X (un-shaded) is defined as: Areas determined to be outside of the 500-year flood-plain.
The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) are conducting on-going projects in the area of Raley Boulevard / Magpie Creek. The proposed project site is located adjacent to the SAFCA/Corps project for Magpie Creek Diversion. This project would require 15± feet landward from the top of the channel to be used as a Flood Protection Easement plus possible additional area for a temporary construction easement. Additionally, the portion of Vinci Avenue immediately west of the Magpie Creek Diversion is proposed to be used as a staging area for this flood control project.

Standards of Significance

Surface/Ground Water. For purposes of this environmental document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increased sediments and other contaminants generated by consumption and/or operation activities.

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

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A, C and D

The proposed project consists of constructing an 62,500± square foot warehouse/office building with parking, loading docks and truck maneuvering area on 3.87± acres. Development of the proposed project would alter absorption rates and surface runoff through the addition of paved surfaces and buildings (impervious surfaces). The proposed project would be required to connect to the City’s storm drain system, to the satisfaction of the Department of Utilities. Additionally, the applicant/developer would be required to comply with the City’s Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Title 15). This ordinance requires the applicant to prepare erosion and sediment control plans for both during and post construction of the proposed project, prepare preliminary and final grading plans, and prepare plans to control urban runoff pollution from the project site during construction. This ordinance also requires that a Post Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan be prepared to minimize the increase of urban runoff pollution caused by development of the area. Since the project is not served by a regional water quality control facility and is greater than one acre, both source controls and on-site treatment control measures are required. Specific source controls are required for (1) commercial/industrial material storage, (2) commercial/industrial outdoor loading/unloading of materials, (3) commercial/industrial vehicle and equipment fueling, (4) commercial/industrial vehicle and equipment maintenance, repair and washing, (5) commercial/industrial outdoor process equipment operations and maintenance and (6) commercial/industrial waste handling. Storm drain maintenance is required at all drain inlets. On-site treatment control measures are also required.

During construction, sediment may contribute to runoff. However, the proposed project is required to comply with the City’s Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Title 15) as described above.

Improvement plans must include the source control measures selected for the site. Because the project is required to comply with the City’s ordinances, the project impacts to water quality is anticipated to be less-than-significant.
General Stormwater Construction Permit

Additionally, development of the site would be required to comply with regulations involving the control of pollution in stormwater discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (Section 402(p), Clean Water Act). The City has obtained a NPDES permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under the requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The regulations, which apply to new construction projects affecting more than one acre that would not involve dredging and filling of wetlands, are administered by the SWRCB on behalf of the USEPA. Under the program, the developer would file a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB to obtain a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit prior to construction of the proposed project.

The developer would be required to prepare and submit to the Department of Utilities for approval, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include information on runoff, erosion control measures to be employed, and any toxic substances to be used during construction activities. Surface runoff and drainage would be handled on site. Potential for erosion due to surface water flow would be primarily limited to embankment slopes and areas disturbed by grading during construction. Short-term, construction-related, erosion control would be readily available by means of Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g., use of erosion control barriers, synthetic slope covers, hydroseeding, etc.). Long-term erosion control, particularly for embankment slopes, would be available by means of establishing vegetation and controlling surface water flow (e.g., use of crown ditches, paved downdrains, vegetated swales, detention basins, etc.).

The SWRCB requires that the best available technology that is economically achievable, and best conventional pollutant control technology be used to reduce pollutants. These features would be discussed in the SWPPP. A monitoring program would be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures included in the SWPPP. The RWQCB may review the final drainage plans for the project components.

Compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements, designed to maintain and improve water quality from development activities, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on drainage and water quality.

Question B

The project site is located within Flood Zone X (un-shaded). The Flood Zone X (un-shaded) consists of areas outside of the 500-year flood-plain. Therefore, impacts from flooding are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

Questions E-G

Dewatering or groundwater pumping is not proposed as a part of the project. However, during construction of future development, groundwater may be encountered and may need to be withdrawn. Any groundwater pumping would need to comply with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) Standards. Therefore, impacts to groundwater are anticipated to be less-than-significant.
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation required

Findings

This project would result in less-than-significant impacts to water resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B)</td>
<td>Exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C)</td>
<td>Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The project area lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The climate of the SVAB is Mediterranean in character, with mild, rainy winter weather from November through March, and warm to hot, dry weather from May through September. The SVAB is subject to eight unique wind patterns. The predominant annual and summer wind pattern is the full sea breeze, commonly referred to as Delta breezes. Wind direction in the SVAB is influenced by the predominant wind flow pattern associated with the season.

The SVAB is subject to federal, state, and local regulations. Both the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board classifies the SVAB as non-attainment for ozone and PM$_{10}$ (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Carbon monoxide (CO) is designated as unclassified/attainment (California Air Resources Board, 1990). The project site is in Sacramento County, under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws.
Standards of Significance

Ozone and Particulate Matter. An increase of nitrogen oxides (NOx) during the construction of the project (short-term effects) above 85 pounds per day would result in a significant impact. An increase of reactive organic gases (ROG) and/or NOx during the operation of the project (long-term effects) above 65 pounds per day would result in a significant impact. An increase of PM10 above 275 pounds per day during the construction or operation of the project would result in a significant impact and require mitigation.

Carbon Monoxide. The pollutant of concern for sensitive receptors is carbon monoxide (CO). Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County (SMAQMD, 1994). For purposes of environmental analysis, sensitive receptor locations generally include parks, sidewalks, transit stops, hospitals, rest homes, schools, playgrounds and residences. Commercial buildings are generally not considered sensitive receptors.

Carbon monoxide concentrations are considered significant if they exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard of 20.0 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard of 9.0 ppm (state ambient air quality standards are more stringent than their federal counterparts).

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Air emissions during construction occur in two phases. Phase I consists of the grading and excavation of the project site, and Phase II is the actual construction of the structures and improvements. Construction activities may cause the air quality to temporarily degrade during the first phase of construction due to emissions from heavy construction equipment and demolition activities. Emissions in the grading and excavation phase of construction are primarily associated with exhaust of heavy equipment and the dust that is generated through grading activities. Dust particulates are unhealthy because they are small enough to inhale and damage lung tissue, leading to respiratory problems. Emissions from demolition and grading and excavation activities are estimated below using SMAQMD construction air quality formulas from the 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook:

Phase I Grading and Excavation Emissions

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>0.95 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>6.05 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>230.51 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated above, grading associated with the proposed project would not generate emissions that exceed SMAQMD adopted significance criteria. Sacramento City Code requires the taking of responsible precautions to prevent and control the movement of dust created by work activities adjoining public or private property. Additionally, the proposed project would also be required to comply with the regulatory requirements of the SMAQMD including Rules 403 (Fugitive Dust). Based upon the estimated emissions and the compliance with the established regulatory requirements, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a less-than-significant impact on air quality from grading activities.
Construction activities during the second phase of construction may also cause the air quality to temporarily degrade. Emissions in the second phase of construction are primarily associated with the actual construction of structures and facilities. Emissions from the construction would be generated primarily from mobile construction equipment.

Emissions from the second phase of construction activities are estimated below, using SMAQMD construction air quality formulas from the 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook:

**Phase II Construction Emissions**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>19.52 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>87.65 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>6.44 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, estimated NO\textsubscript{x} emissions from the second phase of construction activities will slightly exceed air quality thresholds. Mitigation measures consisting of keeping equipment in proper running condition have been identified to reduce the phase II construction emission. With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, the proposed project will have less-than-significant air quality impact from construction activities.

**Phase II Construction Emissions with Mitigation**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>18.70 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>83.29 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>6.12 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-Term or operational emissions are emissions that will be generated from the daily activities at the site once construction is completed. Uses associated with the operation of the proposed project include warehousing for parts distribution with supporting offices. The operational emissions were estimated below using SMAQMD construction air quality formulas from the 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook:

**Long-Term Emissions**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>4.88 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>15.89 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>17.68 lbs/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, estimated operational emissions generated from the proposed project are below the thresholds identified by SMAQMD. Therefore, long-term emissions are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

**Question B**

Some receptors are considered more sensitive than others to air pollutants. The reason for greater sensitivity than the average include pre-existing health problems, proximity to emissions source, or duration of exposure to air pollutants. The only potential sensitive receptor in the vicinity of the project site is the single-family residential unit to the west. However, estimated Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions are shown below using SMAQMD construction air quality formulas from the 1994 Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook. The estimated long-term emissions are below the
threshold identified by SMAQMD and are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated CO Concentration Levels</th>
<th>1 - Hour</th>
<th>8 - Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.82 ppm</td>
<td>3.5 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed CO pollutant thresholds, therefore it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on sensitive receptors.

**Question C**

Development of the proposed project is not expected to result in the alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

**Question D**

Emissions from construction vehicles could create some short-term objectionable odors; however, any construction-related odors would be localized to the immediate vicinity of construction operations and would be temporary, occurring only during active construction. Additionally, Standard Construction Specifications will include compliance with SMAQMD's Rule 405 on dust and condensed fumes. A less-than-significant impact is anticipated to result from construction of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures**

AQ-1. The contractor/developer shall maintain all equipment in proper running condition per the manufacturer's specifications.

**Findings**

With compliance of the applicable regulatory requirements, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on air quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

*Roads.* Proposed access to the project site is from Vinci Avenue, which is an east-west street. Vinci Avenue intersects with Dry Creek Road, which is a two-lane, north-south street in the project vicinity. Interstate 80, Main Avenue, Bell Avenue and Marysville Boulevard provide regional access to the site. Main Avenue is an east-west street in the project area. Raley Boulevard is a north-south, two- to four-lane road that provides connectivity to Interstate 80.

*Public Transportation.* Regional Transit is the major public transportation service provider within Sacramento County providing 20.6 miles of light rail service and fixed-route bus service on 77 routes covering a 418 square-mile area, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Light rail service and many of the bus routes are currently oriented to the downtown area. Currently bus routes 19 travel near the project site on Dry Creek Road with connections at both the Watt/I-80 and Arden/Dell Paso Light Rail Stations. Also bus route 18 travels on Bell Avenue near Dry Creek Road.

*Bikeways.* There are existing on-street bike lanes on Raley Boulevard to the east, and proposed on-
street bike lanes on Ascot Avenue to the north, Dry Creek Road to the west, and Claire Avenue to the south according to the City of Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan.  

Parking. Currently, there is no parking located as the site is vacant and undeveloped.

**Standards of Significance**

*Off-site Roadways.* An impact is considered significant for roadways or intersections when the project causes the facility to change the Level of Service (LOS) C or better to LOS D or worse. For facilities that are, or will be worse than LOS C without the project, an impact is also considered significant if the project: 1) increases the average delay by 5 seconds or more at an intersection, or 2) increases the volume to capacity ratio by 0.02 or more on a roadway.

*Transit.* An impact is considered significant if the project will cause transit boardings to increase beyond the crush load of a transit vehicle or if the project will cause a 10% or greater increase in travel time along any route.

*Bicycles.* An impact is considered significant if implementation of the project will disrupt or interfere with existing or planned (BMP) bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

**Answers to Checklist Questions**

**Question A**

The proposed project will generate additional trips on the roadway network; the anticipated trip generation for the project is 580 Average Daily trips, and 59 AM and 52 PM peak hour trips. The project is consistent with the land uses designated for the project site as reflected in the City of Sacramento General Plan, and North Sacramento Community Plan. Any potential environmental impacts of the land uses in the General Plan and the Community Plan, including the required mitigation measures were identified in the corresponding Environmental Impact Reports (EIR).

Additionally, the Applicant of the proposed project will be required to construct roadway and frontage improvements on Vinci Avenue to City Standards.

Furthermore, the streets in the project area have adequate capacity to accommodate the project generated traffic without being significantly impacted.

In view of the above, and in view of the fact that the project is consistent with the land uses designated in the previously approved land use plans, no new or additional impacts of the current proposed project are anticipated over and above the previously identified impacts in the EIRs for the approved land use plans. In view of this, the impact of the proposed project on transportation and circulation system is considered as less than significant, and no mitigations are therefore necessary.

**Question B**

Public improvements required for the project will be designed to appropriate standards. Therefore, creation of hazards is not expected and no mitigation is required.
Question C

Existing road infrastructure provides adequate emergency access to the proposed project site. The project proposes two new driveways to provide emergency access. The project site will be designed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento Development Engineering and Finance Division (DEF) of the Development Services Department, and the Fire Department. Potential emergency access impacts are considered to be less than significant and do not require mitigation.

Question D

Inadequate parking is not anticipated to result from the proposed project as the proposed parking is within the requirements of the City’s Zoning Code. Additionally, there is space for grading equipment and employees to park on site. As a result, a less-than-significant parking impact is anticipated.

Question E

The proposed project may increase potential bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts. However, the frontage improvements along the project site will include sidewalks to appropriate standards to the satisfaction of City of Sacramento Development Engineering and Finance Division of the Development Services Department. In addition, the proposed project driveways along with sidewalks, curbs, and gutters shall be designed in accordance with City standards to the satisfaction of the Development Engineering and Finance Division. Impacts arising from potential bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts are therefore considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Question F

No policies concerning alternative forms of transportation would be impacted because the site is not being proposed for any alternative forms of transportation. Additionally, the proposed project is not anticipated to impact the existing bike lanes along the Sacramento Northern Parkway and/or the existing bike lanes on Grand Avenue and proposed bike lanes on Norwood Avenue and Morrison Avenue. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

Question G

The project would not result in waterborne or air traffic impacts because the project improvements would be contained within the project site and would be at ground-level. There are no railroad tracks within the project site, so impacts to rail would also be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The project would not result in significant impacts to transportation or circulation.
### Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located on Vinci Avenue between Raley Boulevard and Dry Creek Road north of Interstate 80 in the City of Sacramento. The eastern property boundary is the Magpie Creek Diversion. In May of 2004, North Fork Associates conducted a field assessment of the project site. The property is vacant, undeveloped and has recently been disked. Surrounding uses include open land, rural residential, and industrial. The entire site is ruderal grassland. Dominant species include barbed goatgrass (*Aegilops tritunciulis*), rupgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), foxtail barley (*Hordeum murinum leporinum*), and Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*). The native virgate tarweed (*Holocarpha virgata virgata*) is present along with a small amount of other native species.

Soils consist of San Joaquin loams that have a dense subsurface clay layer that often supports marginal wetland species. On the proposed project site toad rush (*Juncus bufonius*), white meadowfoam (*Limnanthes alba alba*), and hyssop loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolium*) grow in such areas.

The only woody vegetation was a small plum tree (*Prunus sp.*) located in the southwestern corner of the project site. The Magpie Creek Diversion on the east side of the project site also lacked woody vegetation. The only tall trees in the vicinity were a residential grove of eucalyptus several lots to the west.

Very little wildlife was evident during the field assessment, possibly due to the recent disturbance. The site had much evidence of use by black tailed hares, but other wildlife was absent. No squirrel or other small mammal burrows were seen.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage or City street trees)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Status Species
Special Status species are those plants and animals that are legally protected under both the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts (ESA), The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, or the Fish and Game Code of California. In addition, special status species include those species that are not currently protected by statute but which are considered rare or endangered. Special status species are considered to be those species identified by the scientific community to be sufficiently rare to qualify for such listing.

Based upon research conducted by North Fork Associates, 5 special status plant species and 18 special status wildlife species (excluding fish) have the potential to occur in the region. The five special status plant species are associated with vernal pools or emergent marsh and riparian wetlands. These habitats are not present on the site and there is not potential for any of the five species to occur there.

Most of the 18 special status wildlife species that have the potential to occur within the region are associated with habitat that is not present on the proposed project site. However, habitat for three species does occur on the site or adjacent to it. These species include Swainson’s hawk (Buteo swainsoni), burrowing owl (Athene herodias), and giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas).

Swainson’s hawk is a migratory raptor that breeds in open areas with scattered trees. It prefers riparian and sparse oak woodland habitats. It requires nearby grasslands, grain fields, or alfalfa for foraging. The nearest nest locations are along Dry Creek near Rio Linda, north of the subject property.

Burrowing owl is a small ground dwelling raptor found in annual and perennial grasslands. It nests in burrows dug by small mammals, primarily ground squirrels, and prefers short grasslands so that it can observe predators. Burrowing owl locations are primarily west of the Natomas Drain southwest of Rio Linda.

Giant garter snake inhabits freshwater marshes and low gradient streams. Also found in drainage canals and irrigation ditches. The nearest known location is just west of the Natomas Drain, southwest of the Rio Linda.

Wetlands/Waters of the United States
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulate the discharge of dredge and fill material into “waters of the United States” under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands are defined for regulatory purposes as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.” Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, vernal pools, and similar areas (33 CFR 328.3, 40 CFR 230.3). No wetlands were evidenced on the site during the field assessment conducted on May 25, 2004 by North Fork Associates.
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); or
- Violate the Heritage Tree Ordinance (City Code 12:64.040).

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

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

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed project site consists of approximately 3.78± acres of vacant undeveloped land. North Fork Associates conducted a field assessment for a Biological Assessment of the subject site in May of 2004. There was no habitat for special status plants on site. Sanford's arrowhead (Sagittaria sandfordii) and rose-mallow (Hibiscus lasiocarpus) could occur along the drainage on the eastern edge of the site, but this drainage feature and associated species do not occur on the property.

The site does not have suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk, and there is none within a reasonable distance. Development of the site may reduce the potential for foraging habitat for the species. Because known nesting sites are relatively close (roughly 1½ miles away), it is possible that individual hawks may fly over the site and they may even forage on it. However, industrial and urban development around much of the property probably severely limits its use for this species.
No burrowing owls or evidence of the species was present during the May survey. Nor were small mammal burrows observed. Burrowing owls occur at various sites, mostly to the west, and the proposed project site does have suitable habitat if ground squirrels inhabit the area and create burrows. At the time of the survey there was no evidence that ground squirrels or burrowing owls were present on the subject site. However, burrowing owls could move into the area and could inhabit areas within or immediately adjacent to the site.

No giant garter snakes were observed to occur on the proposed project site. The drainage on the east side of the proposed project site provides marginal habitat for the giant garter snake. However, the nearest known occurrence of the snake is two to three miles to the west. To reach the project site from that location, individual snakes would need to migrate through several miles of residential areas where most of the creeks are in stormwater systems or are concrete-lined canals. It is highly unlikely that this species is in the immediate area.

To ensure less-than-significant impacts to special status species, particularly burrowing owls and giant garter snakes, the project will be required to comply with the mitigation measures listed below to ensure potential impacts are less-than-significant.

**Question B**

The only local species the City protects are "Heritage Trees." The City protects "Heritage Trees" by ordinance (City Code 12.64). Heritage Trees are defined by Sacramento’s Heritage Tree Ordinance as:

a. Any trees of any species with a trunk circumference of one hundred (100) inches or more, which is of good quality in terms of health, vigor of growth and conformity to generally accepted horticultural standards of shape and location for its species.

b. Any native Quercus species, Aesculus California or Platanus Racemosa, having a circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a single trunk, or a cumulative circumference of thirty-six (36) inches or greater when a multi-trunk.

c. Any tree thirty-six (36) inches in circumference or greater in a riparian zone. The riparian zone is measured from the center line of the water course to thirty (30) feet beyond the high water line.

d. Any tree, grove of trees or woodland trees, designated by resolution of the city council to be of special historical or environmental value or of significant community benefit.

The only tree to occur on the proposed project site is a small plum tree located on the southwestern corner of the proposed project site. Therefore, impacts to locally designated species including Heritage trees are not anticipated to occur from the proposed project.

**Question C**

The proposed project site supports a few plant species that are weak wetland indicators. These commonly grow in upland locations on heavy soils or on soils where the upper layer has been removed or altered. In places, the soil shows characteristics common to wetland soils. These
redoximorphic features (soil mottling or color patterns in the soil formed by the oxidation and reduction of iron and/or manganese caused by saturated conditions within the soil) were not strong, and they often develop in San Joaquin soils where the clay layer is exposed. None of the plant or soil characteristics occurs in a depression or a swale, as they would under wetland conditions. Therefore, impacts to wetland habitat is anticipated to be less-than-significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

BR-1. Prior to commencement of construction activities, the applicant/developer shall have a qualified biologist conduct pre-construction surveys for the presence or absence of special status species. The surveys shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game protocol. If no evidence of special status species are observed, no additional mitigation is required.

BR-2. If evidence of special status species are observed, the applicant/developer complete all protocol measures for the protection of the special status species observed.

**Findings**

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>ENERGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Power or natural gas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Substantial increase in demand of existing sources of energy or require the development of new sources of energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) is the natural gas utility for the City of Sacramento. Not all areas are currently provided with gas service. PG&E gas transmission pipelines are concentrated north of the City of Sacramento. Distribution pipelines are located throughout the City, usually underground along City and County public utility easements (PUEs).
The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) supplies electricity to the City of Sacramento. SMUD operates a variety of hydroelectric, photovoltaic, geothermal and co-generation powerplants. SMUD also purchases power from PG&E and the Western Area Power Administration. Major electrical transmission lines are located in the northeastern portion of the City of Sacramento.

Standards of Significance

Gas Service. A significant environmental impact would result if a project would require PG&E to secure a new gas source beyond their current supplies.

Electrical Services. A significant environmental impact would occur if a project resulted in the need for a new electrical source (e.g., hydroelectric and geothermal plants).

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - C

Development of the proposed project would require the use of energy when completed and also during construction. However, this energy use would not require the development of new sources of energy nor would it result in substantial increases in demand for energy. The proposed project is consistent with the designated land use and would not substantially increase energy consumption beyond what was originally planned for through the North Sacramento Community Plan. Therefore a less-than-significant impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Findings

The project would not result in impacts to energy resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. HAZARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal involve:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A)</td>
<td>A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B)</td>
<td>Possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C)</td>
<td>The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D)</td>
<td>Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E)</td>
<td>Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The proposed project site is currently vacant and undeveloped land in the North Sacramento Community Plan area. The site is adjacent to, the west of the channelized Magpie Creek Diversion. On the other eastern side of the channel is developed industrial uses that access Raley Boulevard. Further east of the site beyond Raley Boulevard is the former McClellan Air Force Base that was decommissioned July of 2002.

**Standards of Significance**

For the purposes of this document, 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
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during de-watering activities; or
• expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to increase fire hazards.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A, C & D

The project site does not appear to contain any hazardous materials. During a site visit in March of 2004 no evidence of hazardous substances were observed. However, due to the proximity of the site to the McClellan Air Force Base site and the unknown activities that may have occurred at the site, contaminants could be discovered during regular construction or excavation activities. Construction activities are regulated by the Occupational Health & Safety Administration (OSHA) and state and local building codes. Because construction activities are required to comply with all applicable health and safety laws, hazards impacts during construction and use of the site are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

Questions B & E

The proposed projects consists of developing a warehouse with supporting offices. The project would not interfere with an emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project site if developed would eliminate the potential for brush fires to occur at the site. The proposed project is required to meet the Uniform Fire Code standards. Therefore, impacts to emergency evacuation plans and fire hazards are considered to be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts regarding hazards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Increases in existing noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The SGPU DEIR indicated that the three major noise sources in the City of Sacramento are surface traffic, aircraft, and the railroad (AA-1). The major noise source in the project area is aircraft noise from McClellan Park which has runways a little over a mile to the east of the project site. According to the SGPU DEIR, the proposed project site is within the 60 Ldn noise contour for McClellan Park but outside of the 65 Ldn noise contour (SGPU DEIR, AA-35). The former Air Force Base is closed now and has different mix of aircraft use, which in general are quieter than military aircraft.

**Standards of Significance**

Thresholds of significance are those established by the Title 24 standards and by the City’s General Plan Noise Element and the City Noise Ordinance. Noise and vibration impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if they cause any of the following results:

- Exterior noise levels at the proposed project, which are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses (SGPU DEIR AA-27) caused by noise level increases due to the project. The maximum normally acceptable exterior community noise exposure for commercial uses is 65 dB Ldn, for residential backyards it is 60 dB Ldn, and for residential interior it is 45 dB Ldn;

- Construction noise levels not in compliance with the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance;
- Occupied existing and project residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;

- Project residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; and

- Historic buildings and archaeological sites are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.25 inches per second due to project construction, highway traffic, and rail operations.

Construction-generated sound is exempt from limits if construction activities take place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday-Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays as specified in Section 8.68.080 of the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance.

Answers to Checklist Questions
Questions A and B

The major noise source in the project area is aircraft noise from McClellan Park. Based upon the noise contours presented in the SGPU DEIR, page AA-35, the proposed project is located within the 60 Ldn noise contour but is outside the 65 Ldn noise contour. The SGPU DEIR identifies a 70 dB as the upper limit for "normally acceptable" exterior noise levels for industrial land uses and 65 dB as the upper limit for "normally acceptable" office land uses. The proposed project is located outside of the 65 Ldn contour and is therefore, not anticipated to be significantly affected by aircraft noise from McClellan Park.

Development of the proposed project site as a warehouse and supporting office for a parts distribution will generate new sources of noise. However, the noise generated from the site will generally occur from truck traffic. The proposed layout of the project has the loading docks for the warehouse located on the eastern side of the building, opposite of the residences to the west. Based upon this site design and the shielding of the loading docks, operations at the site are anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on any sensitive receptors. Both the current General Plan and North Sacramento Community Plan land use designations for this area are Industrial. There is also a trucking company located to the west of the proposed project site, which contains heavy trucks that travel to and from the site. The proposed project will increase truck traffic along Vinci Avenue; however, noise levels are not anticipated to significantly increase over the uses that currently exist and are designated for the area. As a result a less-than-significant noise impact is anticipated from operations of the site.

Noise would also be generated from construction of the proposed project. However, construction-generated sound is exempt from limits if construction activities take place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday-Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays as specified in Section 8.68.080 of the City of Sacramento Noise Ordinance.

Mitigation Measures

No Mitigation required.
Findings

With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this section, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant noise impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Other governmental services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The nearest fire station to the proposed project site is Station No. 17 located at 1311 Bell Avenue, located approximately 1.5 miles to the south.

The area is served by the Sacramento City Police Department. The William J. Kinney Police Facility is located approximately 2.5 miles to the south at 3550 Marysville Boulevard.

The proposed project site is within the Robla and Grant Joint Union High School Districts.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this report, 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, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - E

Although government services would be needed to serve the project site, this would not result in the need for an alteration to existing services nor would it result in the need to construct any new
facilities to provide the additional services. The proposed project is consistent with the designated land uses for the site. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact on public services is anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Findings**

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to public services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Communication systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Local or regional water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Sewer or septic tanks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Storm water drainage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Solid waste disposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

*Telephone.* SBC provides telephone service to the project site and throughout the surrounding area. Telephone service to the project area is provided primarily with aboveground transmission lines.

*Water.* The City provides water service from a combination of surface and groundwater sources. The area south of the American River is served by surface water from the American and Sacramento Rivers. The City also pumps groundwater to areas north of the American River. Eventually, the City intends to balance its use of surface and groundwater, requiring surface water in the north area. There is an existing 12" water main in Vinci Avenue, adjacent to the site.

*Stormwater Drainage.* The proposed project is located within Drainage Basin 157-G200, which utilizes the Magpie Creek Diversion Canal. The project site is directly west of the Magpie Creek Diversion and can drain by gravity to the drainage main in Vinci Avenue, then to Magpie Creek
Diversion. The Magpie Creek Diversion drains to the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal. There is a project proposed by SAFCA to provide better flood protection in the area. The project site will be required to dedicate or set aside for purchase, additional right-of-way adjacent to the Magpie Creek Diversion for a Flood Protection Levee Easement (15±) and a Temporary Work Area Easement (undetermined width).

Sewage. Sanitary sewer service is available to North Sacramento. The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provides sewage treatment for the cities of Folsom and Sacramento and County Sanitation District (CSD)-1, which serve the unincorporated urban portions of the County and portions of Sacramento.

The SRCSD is responsible for the operation of all regional interceptors and wastewater treatment plants, while local collection districts operate the systems that transport less than 10 million gallons of waste flow daily. A local sewer system has not been constructed in Vinci Avenue from Dry Creek Road to the site (approx. 1400 feet). Its anticipated the Cope McPeters project will extend the sewer approximately 550 feet east of Dry Creek Road, leaving approximately 850 linear feet to be constructed.

Solid Waste. The project is required to meet the City’s Recycling and Solid Waste Disposal Regulations (Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Ordinance). The purpose of the ordinance is to regulate the location, size, and design of features of recycling and trash enclosures in order to provide adequate, convenient space for the collection, storage, and loading of recyclable and solid waste material for existing and new development; increase recycling of used materials; and reduce litter.

Standards of Significance
For purposes of this environmental document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Result in a detriment to microwave, radar, or radio transmissions;
- Create an increase in water demand of more than 10 million gallons per day;
- Substantially degrade water quality;
- Generate more than 500 tons of solid waste per year; or
- Generate storm water that would exceed the capacity of the storm water system.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A
The proposed project is consistent with the designated uses of the site and would not create impacts to existing communication systems, nor create the need for new communication systems. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.

Questions B, C, and E
The proposed project will be required to connect to the City’s water distribution and drainage systems. All connections to the City’s utility system will be done to the satisfaction of the City’s Department of Utilities. The City’s Department of Utilities has reviewed the proposed project to ensure that adequate water is available.
Additionally, post construction, stormwater quality control measures shall be incorporated into the development to minimize the increase of urban runoff pollution caused by development of the area. Only source control measures are required (refer to "Guidance Manual for On-site Stormwater Quality Control Measures" January 2000 for appropriate source control measures).

Because the project is required to comply with the City’s ordinances, the project impacts on the City’s water supply, water distribution infrastructure, and drainage facilities are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

**Question D**
The proposed project is consistent with the designated uses for the site. It is anticipated that a septic system will be provided on site or sanitary sewer piping constructed by the applicant to handle the sewer flows generated by the site. All public sewers shall be coordinated with and approved by the Department of Utilities. As the project poses no change in designated land use, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on sewer services.

**Question F**
Prior to issuance of a building permit by the Building Division the applicant would be required to comply with the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Title 17.72 of the City Code). This section addresses recycling and solid waste disposal requirements for new and existing developments, which are designed to reduce impacts from the disposal of solid waste. Because the proposed project will be required to comply with this ordinance, it is anticipated to result in less-than-significant impacts from solid waste.

**Mitigation Measures**
No mitigation is required.

**Findings**
The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to utility systems.
13. AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE

Would the proposal:

A) Affect a scenic vista or adopted view corridor?  

B) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?  

C) Create light or glare?  

D) Create shadows on adjacent property?  

Environmental Setting

The project site is not in an adopted view corridor or a scenic vista. The project area is presently vacant and primarily surrounded by vacant land designated for industrial uses. There are existing developed residential units and industrial sites located to the west of the site on Vinci Avenue and some developed industrial sites located to the east of the project site. The project site is located within the Expanded North Area Design Review District.

Standards of Significance

Visual impacts would include obstruction of a significant view or viewshed or the introduction of a façade which lacks visual interest and compatibility which would be visible from a public gathering or viewing area.

Shadows. New shadows from developments are generally considered to be significant if they would shade a recognized public gathering place (e.g., park) or place residences/child care centers in complete shade.

Glare. Glare is considered to be significant if it would be cast in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time.

Light. Light is considered significant if it would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.
Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

The proposed project is not within an identified scenic corridor or viewshed so impacts to an identified scenic corridor or viewshed would be less-than-significant. The proposed project is located within the Expanded North Area Design Review District and will be required to get approval for the design of the building. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on aesthetics.

Questions C and D

The proposed project would require improvements to the City rights-of-way. These improvements may require the installation of street lighting. The lighting would be installed to meet City standards. Additionally, landscaping will be installed as required by City Ordinance.

With the design and orientation of lighting in compliance with the City Ordinance, impacts associated with light and glare are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The project is determined to have a less-than-significant impact to aesthetics, light, or glare.
### Environmental Setting

The proposed project is within a Primary Impact Area as defined by the Sacramento General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (SGPU) (DEIR, V-5). The SGPU defines a Primary Impact Area as an area that is most sensitive to urban development due to the potential presence of cultural resources.

The proposed project area is currently vacant and does not appear to contain any evidence of historical or cultural resources. The site is directly west of the channelized portion of the Magpie Creek Diversion.

### Standards of Significance

Cultural resource impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or

2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - D

The project site does not contain any known cultural or historical resources, nor were any evident during a site visit in March of 2004. During construction where excavation could occur, previously unidentified cultural or historical resources may be unearthed. The mitigation measures listed below shall be implemented to ensure a less-than-significant impact:

Question E

There are no known existing religious or sacred uses on the project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that religious or sacred uses will be impacted by the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

CR-1. If subsurface archaeological or historical remains are discovered during construction, work in the area shall stop immediately and a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less-than-significant level before construction continues.

CR-2. If human burials are encountered, all work in the area shall stop immediately and the Sacramento County Coroner’s office shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendants must be notified and recommendations for treatment solicited (CEQA Section 15064.5); Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and 5097.98.

Findings

The project is expected to have less-than-significant impacts on cultural resources with the incorporation of the above mitigation measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Affect existing recreational opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting
There are no existing recreational amenities within the project site, as the site is currently vacant private property. Surrounding uses consist of vacant land and residential and industrial uses. To the north is a church type structure. The area immediately to the east consists of the Magpie Creek Diversion, beyond that are existing industrial uses.

Standards of Significance
Recreation impacts would be considered significant if the project created a new demand for additional recreational facilities or affected existing recreational opportunities.

Answers to Checklist Questions
Questions A and B
The proposed project would not affect existing recreational opportunities because there are no existing recreational amenities within the project site. The proposed project is consistent with the North Sacramento Community Plan and the Sacramento General Plan Update land use designations. Additionally, the proposed use of the site for industrial uses would not create the need for additional park or recreational facilities. Therefore, recreational impacts are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Findings
The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to recreational resources.
### MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less-than-significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long term environmental goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Disturb paleontological resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mandatory Findings of Significance Discussion

A. As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the project will not 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, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Mitigation measures have been included to ensure impacts to biological resources are less-than-significant. Additionally, the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

B. As discussed in the preceding section, the project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

C. When impacts are considered along with, or in combination with other impacts, the project-related impacts are less-than-significant. The proposed project will not add substantially to any cumulative effects. Project related impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; therefore cumulative effects are not considered a significant impact.

D. The project does not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly with the implementation of mitigation measure for potential air quality and noise impacts. The site is not known to contain any hazards. However, construction activities could reveal previously unknown hazards. The proposed project is required to comply with all applicable laws concerning hazardous materials. There are no known paleontological resources on the site. Mitigation measures concerning how to handle paleontological resources were included in the case previously unidentified resources are uncovered during construction activities.
SECTION IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geological Problems
- Water
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Circulation
- Biological Resources
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- None Identified
- Hazards
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Aesthetics, Light & Glare
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
SECTION V. DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

__________________________  ____________
Signature                          Date

Scott Johnson
Printed Name