

*City of*  
**SACRAMENTO**

---

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
SERVICES

300 Richards Boulevard  
Third Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

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

**7-Eleven Convenience Store and Fuel Station Project, Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court (Z25-110)** The proposed project consists of a request for: (1) construction and operation of an approximately 4,761-square-foot convenience store and fuel station on the approximately 1.4-acre parcel in the Highway Commercial (HC-R) zone; and (2) the sale of tobacco products in a building less than 15,000-square feet in the HC-R zone.

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


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

A copy of this document and all supportive documentation is available on the City's EIR Webpage at:

<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/community-development/planning/environmental>

On behalf of Scott Johnson, Environmental  
Services Manager, City of Sacramento, California

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Tschudin

Date: May 15, 2026

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Organization of the Initial Study.....	1
Section I - Background .....	2
Section II - Project Description .....	4
1. Project Location .....	4
2. Project Setting and Surrounding Land Use .....	4
3. Site Planning and Zoning Designation.....	4
4. Project Components .....	5
5. Entitlements and Approvals .....	7
Section III – Environmental Checklist and Discussion.....	8
1. Land Use, Population and Housing, Agricultural Resources, Wildfire.....	8
2. Aesthetics.....	10
3. Air Quality.....	14
4. Biological Resources .....	22
5. Cultural Resources .....	30
6. Energy.....	34
7. Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontology.....	37
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	41
9. Hazards and Public Safety.....	47
10. Hydrology, Water Quality, and Flooding .....	52
11. Noise and Vibration.....	56
12. Public Services .....	64
13. Recreation.....	66
14. Transportation and Circulation.....	68
15. Tribal Cultural Resources .....	73
16. Utilities.....	76
17. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	80
Section IV - Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	83
Section V - Determination.....	84
Section VI - References Cited .....	85
1. References.....	85
2. Personal Communication.....	86
Section VII – Preparers .....	87

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sacramento Municipal Air Quality Management District Thresholds of Significance.....	16
Table 2. Estimated Daily Maximum Construction Emissions (pounds).....	17
Table 3. Estimated Daily Operational Emissions (pounds).....	18
Table 4. Estimated Annual Operational Emissions (tons).....	19
Table 5. Estimated Un-Mitigated Health Impacts for Existing Residences and Off-site Employees During Construction.....	19
Table 6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions During Construction.....	43
Table 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions During Operation.....	43
Table 8. Project Consistency with City of Sacramento Climate Action and Adaptation Plan.....	44
Table 9. Exterior Noise Compatibility Standards for Various Land Uses.....	57
Table 10. Criteria for Assessing General Vibration Impacts for Various Land Uses.....	59
Table 11. Long-Term (72-Hour) Noise Monitoring Results at the Nearest Sensitive Receptor.....	60
Table 12. Cumulative On-site Operational Noise Levels at the Nearest Sensitive Receptor.....	61

## LIST OF APPENDICES

### Appendix A – Figures

- Figure 1. Site and Vicinity Map
- Figure 2. Aerial Map
- Figure 3. General Plan Land Use Designations
- Figure 4. Zoning Designations
- Figure 5. Important Farmlands Map
- Figure 6. Soils Map

### Appendix B – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

### Appendix C – Site Photographs

### Appendix D – Plans and Exhibits

- C1. Preliminary Site Plan
- C2. Preliminary Grading Plan
- C3. Preliminary Utility Plan
- Exterior Colored Elevations
- Color Canopy and Dumpster Elevations
- L1. Preliminary Landscape Plans
- Color Illumination Rendering
- Black and White Illumination Rendering

### Appendix E – Air Quality Technical Report

### Appendix F – Biological Resources Evaluation

### Appendix G – Cultural Resources Assessment

### Appendix H – Geotechnical Exploration Report

### Appendix I – Cover Letter to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

### Appendix J – Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment

### Appendix K – Transportation Analysis

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAQS	ambient air quality standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
amsl	above mean sea level
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
BMPs	best management practices
BRE	Biological Resources Evaluation
CAAP	City of Sacramento Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards; California Code of Regulations Part 11, Title 24
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
Candela	the base unit of luminous intensity in the International System of Units that is emitted in unit time per unit solid angle
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBSC	California Building Standards Code
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEC	California Energy Commission
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level, measurements are a weighted average of sound levels gathered throughout a 24-hour period
COx	carbon oxides
CRA	Cultural Resources Assessment
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel scale, measurement of noise
DSH	diameter at standard height (54 inches above grade)
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESA	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	federal Endangered Species Act
GHG	greenhouse gas
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
Ldn	Ldn or day-night average sound level, is an average 24-hour noise measurement that factors in day and night noise levels.
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
Lux	a unit of illumination equal to the direct illumination on a surface that is everywhere one meter from a uniform point source of one candle intensity or equal to one lumen per square meter

**ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (continued)**

MLD	most likely descendent
MT	metric ton(s)
MS4 Permit	Municipal Stormwater Discharge Permit
NAHC	California State Native American Heritage Commission
NBHCP	Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NOx	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
OEHHA	California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PM2.5	particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers (fine)
PM10	particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (coarse)
ppm	parts per million
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCH	RCH Group, Inc.
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROW	rights-of-way
SacRT	Sacramento Regional Transit
SacSewer	Sacramento Area Sewer District
SALEM	SALEM Engineering Group, Inc.
SB	Senate Bill
SBC	Stringer Biological Consulting, Inc.
SMAQMD	Sacramento Municipal Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SOx	sulfur oxides
SQIP	Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan
SR	State Route
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWE	SummitWest Environmental, Inc.
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TNBC	The Natomas Basin Conservancy
µg/m <sup>3</sup>	micrograms per cubic meter
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VdB	vibration decibels
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compounds
WEAP	Worker Environmental Awareness Program
YPCE	Sacramento Department of Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment



**7-ELEVEN CONVENIENCE STORE AND FUEL STATION,  
NORTHGATE BOULEVARD AND ROSIN COURT (Z25-110)**

**INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS  
UNDER THE 2040 GENERAL PLAN MASTER EIR**

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

---

**ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY**

---

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

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

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

**SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION:** Reviews proposed project and states whether the project would have additional significant environmental effects (project- specific effects) that were not evaluated in the Master EIR for the 2040 General Plan.

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

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

**SECTION VI - REFERENCES CITED:** Identifies source materials that have been consulted in the preparation of the Initial Study.

**SECTION VII - PREPARERS:** Individuals responsible for preparation of this Initial Study.

**SECTION I - BACKGROUND**

---

**Project Name and File Number:** 7-Eleven Convenience Store and Fuel Station, Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court (Z25-110)

**Project Location:** 3781 Northgate Blvd, Sacramento, CA, 95834 (APN 250-001-0115-0000). See Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix A.

**Project Applicant:** Guggenheim Development Services, LLC  
300 Internet Blvd., Suite 570  
Frisco TX 75034  
Contact: Jesse Kent, (916) 969-7472

**Project Planner:** Deja Harris, Associate Planner  
City of Sacramento  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Blvd. 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**Environmental Planner:** Charles Tschudin, Senior Planner  
  
City of Sacramento  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Blvd. 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**Draft Initial Study Completed:** May 2026

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

The Sacramento Community Development Department has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the 2040 General Plan Master EIR (Master EIR; City of Sacramento 2024a) and is consistent with the land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site as set forth in the 2040 General Plan (City of Sacramento 2024b. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b).

The City has prepared the Initial Study to review the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR to determine their adequacy for the project (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b),(c)) and identify any potential new or additional project-specific significant environmental effects that were not analyzed in the Master EIR and any mitigation measures or alternatives that may avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance, if any. Project-specific mitigation measures contained herein are incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which includes the mitigation measure implementation responsibility, monitoring responsibility, and timing, and is included as Appendix B to this Initial Study.

As part of the Master EIR process, the City is required to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(d)) Policies included in the 2040 General Plan that reduce significant impacts identified in the Master EIR are identified and discussed. See also the Master EIR for the 2040 General Plan. The mitigation monitoring plan for the 2040 General Plan, which provides references to applicable General Plan policies that reduce the environmental effects of development that may occur consistent with the General Plan, is included in the adopting resolution for the Master EIR (see City Council Resolution No. 2024-0067; State Clearinghouse #2019012048).

7-Eleven Convenience Store and Fuel Station Project, Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court  
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

This analysis incorporates by reference the general discussion portions of the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The Master EIR is available for public review at the City of Sacramento's web site at:

<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/community-development/planning/environmental/impact-reports#anchor-2040-dd44-5460>

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Written comments should be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending June 16, 2026.

Please send written responses to:

Charles Tschudin, Senior Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Sacramento  
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
Direct Line: (916) 808-8145  
[ctschudin@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:ctschudin@cityofsacramento.org)

---

## SECTION II - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

### 1. PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is in the northern area of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, California. The project site is northwest of the intersection of Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court. Interstate 80 (I-80) is approximately 0.2 mile north of the project site.

The project site totals approximately 1.4 acres and is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 250-001-0115-0000. The address associated with the project site is 3781 Northgate Boulevard, Sacramento, CA, 95834. Refer to Figure 1 in Appendix A for the project's location in the region and Figure 2 for an aerial map of the project site.

### 2. PROJECT SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USE

The project site is within an area of the City featuring a mix of urban development, vacant land, and agricultural parcels. The project site is bound by Northgate Boulevard to the northeast and Rosin Court to the southeast and southwest. Properties immediately surrounding the project site are zoned Highway Commercial (HC-R). An existing KFC restaurant is directly northwest of the project site, and McDonald's southeast of the project site, across Rosin Court. Existing development east of Northgate Boulevard include various highway-serving businesses, including fast food restaurants and hotels. The zoning transitions to Light Industrial Zone, M-1S, with office land uses approximately 425 feet east of the project site. Properties west of the project site are undeveloped. The zoning transitions from Highway Commercial, HC-R, to Agricultural, A, approximately 680 feet west of the project site. Residential neighborhoods are approximately 500 feet south of the project site and 0.4 mile west of the project site, with no existing buildings or topographical features between the project site and residences.

The project site is currently undeveloped but, based on review of historic aerial imagery, parts of the site have been previously developed and/or disked, scraped or otherwise disturbed. The entire site is characterized as disturbed. Terrain in the immediate vicinity and within the project site is relatively flat, with an elevation of approximately 18 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the project site. The project site is characterized by primarily grassy and weedy vegetation interspersed by disturbed soils with gravel or other remnant construction materials evident in the surface soil layers. No trees were observed on the project site. Refer to Appendix C for photographs of the project site and the surrounding areas.

All streets adjacent to the project site are paved and Northgate Boulevard features two through-lanes in each direction, plus one dedicated right-turn lane and two dedicated left-turn lanes in the southbound direction. Southeast of the project site, Rosin Court features one through-lane in each direction, with one dedicated right turn lane in the southwest direction, and two dedicated left turn lanes and a dedicated right-turn lane in the northeast bound direction. Southwest of the project site, Rosin Court is a two-lane roadway with no painted lanes. The project site roadway frontage for all adjacent roadways features curb and gutter and sidewalks. The intersection of Northgate Boulevard with Rosin Court is traffic signal controlled with pedestrian crosswalks at each leg of the intersection.

### 3. SITE PLANNING AND ZONING DESIGNATION

The project site is located within the City's South Natomas Community Plan area which encompasses approximately 8 square miles directly north of Downtown Sacramento. The Plan Area is bound by I-80 to the west and north, Ueda Parkway to the east, and the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers to the south. The Plan designates the project site as Residential Mixed-Use (RMU). The City uses community plans to provide policy direction for various areas of the City based on conditions or issues unique to each community plan area. The community plan areas allow for more focused policy and direction within the City.

The project site is designated as Residential Mixed Use in the 2040 General Plan and is within the HC-R, Highway Commercial zoning district (City of Sacramento 2025a). The HC zone permits by right the development of fuel stations and retail stores not exceeding 5,000 square feet. Tobacco sales in buildings less than 15,000 square feet are subject to a Conditional Use Permit approved by the Zoning Administrator (City of Sacramento Code Section 17.224.410). Refer to Figures 3 and 4 in Appendix A for the 2024 General Plan land use and zoning designations.

#### **4. PROJECT COMPONENTS**

The proposed project includes a convenience store, fuel station for standard vehicles, and parking for standard vehicle, including electric vehicle parking stations and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant spaces. Landscaping and lighting would be installed. The components of the proposed project are described in more detail below. Refer to the Preliminary Site Plan (Sheet C1) in Appendix D.

##### **Convenience Store and Fuel Station**

The project development would include a 7-Eleven convenience store, four conventional gas station islands, and eight electric vehicle charging parking spaces.

The convenience store would be approximately 4,761 square feet and would be situated in the southeast portion of the project site, allowing pedestrian access directly from Northgate Boulevard. The store front would face northwest, toward the proposed gas station islands. The anticipated building height is 21 feet, 4 inches with a 24-foot, 8-inch-tall parapet panel at the storefront – the building would not exceed 50 feet in height. The proposed building would feature a neutral, beige-colored masonry exterior with a parapet comprised of vertically placed cedar-colored fiber cement panels. Black corrugated metal accent panels would cover a portion of the storefront, and the sides of the buildings. Black metal finishes would be used for the doorways, windows, canopies, downspouts and edging. Refer to the Exterior Colored Elevations in Appendix D for typical building elevations and materials.

The convenience store would include an approximately 2,800-square-foot sales floor with seating and sales/checkout area. The store also includes a backroom, manager's office, utility and coolers/storage areas, and men's and women's public restrooms. Store entrances/exits would include double doors at the storefront and a single door at the rear of the building (two entrances/exits). The total building occupancy would not exceed 99 people.

The four gas station islands would be constructed in the northern portion of the project site and would feature an approximately 3,350-square-foot canopy. The islands would accommodate up to eight vehicles at a time (two per gas station island). Eight electric vehicle charging parking spaces would be located west of the convenience store, south of the gas station islands.

Two 20,000 underground fuel storage tanks and an enclosed Healy tank would be located in the northern area of the project site. An enclosed trash area and an air and water station would be adjacent to the parking area in the southern area of the project site, southwest of the convenience store.

##### **Site Access and Parking, Bicycle Facilities**

###### Vehicular Access and Circulation

Access to the project site would be provided by two driveways accessing Rosin Court southwest of the project site. Both driveways would be 35 feet wide and paved and would allow all turning movements. An additional two-way driveway in the northern portion of the project site would connect with the existing KFC restaurant northwest of the project site.

Vehicular circulation allows access to vehicle parking and the conventional fuel islands in the northern portion of the site, and to the parking and electric vehicle charging stations in the southwest portion of the project site. Drive paths 49 feet to 82 feet wide would allow vehicles to fully circle the fuel island and convenience store in opposing directions and would allow circulation for fuel supply trucks to fill the fuel storage tanks and to collect waste from the covered trash enclosure.

###### Parking

Parking for the convenience store and fuel station would include 25 parking spaces, including two American with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant spaces in front of the convenience store and eight power-ready electric vehicle parking spaces.

###### Pedestrian Access and Circulation

Existing paved sidewalks extend adjacent to and through the project site boundary along Northgate Boulevard northeast of the project site, and along Rosin Court southeast and southwest of the project site. The existing sidewalk along Northgate Boulevard is located outside of the existing parcel (project site) while the sidewalk following the stretch of Rosin Court southeast and southwest of the project site extends into the property boundary. The existing sidewalks would be retained and incorporated into the project's design. On-site designated pedestrian

access would be provided through minimum 5-foot-wide walkways around the entire perimeter of the convenience store, allowing access to the adjacent parking areas, and to the sidewalk along Northgate Boulevard northeast of the convenience store.

#### Bicycle Facilities

A bicycle rack and locker providing two bicycle parking spaces would be installed northeast of the convenience store.

#### Landscaping and Lighting

Landscaping would comprise approximately 19,303 square feet of the project site. The landscape design would consist of water efficient landscaping per Sacramento City Code Chapter 15.92. The landscape palette would consist of low water trees to provide ROW landscaping, on-site accent features, screening and parking lot shade. Trees would consist of a variety of species typical for landscaping in the area, including various native and non-native oaks and evergreen trees. Accent trees would be placed at each of the project driveways at Rosin Court, and the pedestrian walkway at Northgate Boulevard. Screen shrubs would be strategically placed around loading and parking areas, trash enclosures, and mechanical equipment. The remaining landscaped areas would feature ground cover consisting of a combination of flowering seed mixes, shrubs, and flowering plants. All landscaped areas would feature an automatic irrigation system. Refer to the Preliminary Landscape Plan (Sheet L1) in Appendix D.

Lighting would consist of a combination of pole-, building-, and fuel canopy-mounted fixtures. Pole lighting would be installed at the project driveways and along the perimeter of the parking areas, and would consist of a combination of single, double and triple-head lights. Canopy lighting would be installed under the fuel canopies, and the convenience store canopies, and wall mount luminaires would be installed on the convenience store exterior. All lighting would be energy efficient, LED non-glare, directional cut-off fixtures, intended to avoid light spill-over to adjacent properties. Refer to illuminance renderings in color and black and white in Appendix D.

#### Utilities

The site would be served by domestic water, and storm drains from public mains extended and connected to the City system. Wastewater and sewer services are provided by the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer). Existing water, sanitary sewer and storm drain facilities are located within Rosin Court west of the project site. An existing fire hydrant is located at the northwest corner of the project site along Rosin Court.

Sand/oil separators would be installed under the fuel canopy, and a grease interceptor would be installed northeast of the convenience store. Both would be installed as part of the project's sewer facilities.

SMUD provides electricity to the project site. The project is located in SMUD's Ward 5 District (SMUD 2025). Onsite transformers and switchgear installed as part of the project would connect with the existing SMUD transformer west of the intersection of Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court. Refer to the Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C3) in Appendix D. Note that although a natural gas connection is shown on the site plan, it is included in error, and natural gas would not be used for the project. Refer to "Operations," below, for anticipated water, wastewater and electricity use.

#### Site Drainage

The project site would feature three separate drainage areas: (1) the conventional vehicle fueling and parking area; (2) the northwest area of the project site (between the on-site parking area and the adjacent property northwest of the project site); and (3) the southwestern/western area of the project site (along Rosin Court). In drainage area 1, stormwater from the paved areas of the site would drain toward two V-gutters buffering the fuel island which would direct flows to the northeast toward a drainage swale along Northgate Boulevard. Flows from the drainage swale would enter a storm drain inlet in the northern area of the project site and would connect with an underground storm drain. In drainage area 2, flows along the northwest boundary of the project site would flow toward a storm drain inlet in the northwest area of the project site and would connect with an underground storm drain. In drainage area 3, flows from the southwestern/western area of the project site would enter a drainage swale along Rosin Court southwest of the project site. Flows from the drainage swale would enter a storm drain inlet in the southern part of the project site and would connect with an underground storm drain. On-site storm drains would connect with the existing storm drain in Rosin Court west of the project site. Refer to the Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C3) in Appendix D.

## Signage

Signage for the convenience store and fuel station would include at least one monument sign. Additional signs may include directional signage at each access driveway to the site; flush-mount signage on the storefront and rear of the convenience store; electric vehicle charging station signage and fuel island canopy signs. All signage would be consistent with Sacramento City standards.

## Construction

Construction is anticipated to begin in late fall/early winter 2026 and would last approximately 9 months. Construction activities would primarily occur Monday through Friday during daytime hours. Construction activities would include excavation reaching depths of up to 18 feet for the underground storage tanks, and 4 feet to 5 feet in depth for utilities and the building foundation. Installation of the street frontage directional signs would require excavation to only 24 inches in depth for the pole foundation.

During construction, the project site would be cleared and graded and excavation for underground utilities, foundations, and underground storage tanks would occur. A total of 697 cubic yards of soil are anticipated to be imported. Approximately 35,178 square feet of the project site would be paved for the proposed project.

Minimal trenching off-site may be required for utility connections in Rosin Court and minimal ground disturbance to construct the sidewalk connecting with the existing sidewalk along Northgate Boulevard. No other off-site improvements are anticipated.

## Operations

The convenience store and fuel station would operate 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Approximately 12 people would be employed at the facility, with 2 to 4 employees working per eight-hour shift.

The fuel stations are expected to dispense up to 850,000 gallons per year of conventional and diesel fuel.

Indoor and outdoor water usage could reach approximately 2,700 gallons per day and electricity usage would total approximately 20,000 kilowatt hours per month. The project would generate approximately 1,584 gallons of wastewater per day (based on City's assumption of 132 gallons per capita per day [gpcd] x 12 employees) and 143 pounds per day of solid waste.

## 5. ENTITLEMENTS AND APPROVALS

City of Sacramento:

- Zoning Administrator approval of Conditional Use Permit for tobacco sales
- Site Plan and Design Review

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District:

- Permits to construct/operate

Central Valley Regional Quality Control Board:

- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) for project construction

### SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

---

#### 1. LAND USE, POPULATION AND HOUSING, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES, WILDFIRE

##### Introduction

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

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

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

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

##### Discussion

###### Land Use

The parcel associated with the proposed project is designated as Residential Mixed Use in the 2040 General Plan and is within the HC-R, Highway Commercial zoning district (City of Sacramento 2025a). The development gas stations, retail stores up to 5,000 square feet are permitted by right in the HC zone. Tobacco sales in a store with 15,000 square feet or less are permitted in the HC zone with issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, with approval by the zoning administrator.

The project site is located in an area that transitions from a mix of residential and agricultural land uses to urbanized areas of the community. The project site is surrounded by agricultural and commercial land uses. Development of the site as proposed would alter the existing landscape, but the project site has been designated for urban development in the 2040 General Plan and the Planning and Development Code, and the proposed development is consistent with these planning designations.

###### Population and Housing

The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes or extension of roads or infrastructure associated with unplanned population growth; however, operation of the convenience store and fuel station would offer new opportunities for employment. The facility would employ approximately 12 people. While the employees would likely be hired from the existing working population in the area, the opportunity could potentially attract new residents to the City. The City's estimated population was 472,693 in 2018 and is projected to reach 638,433 by 2040 (City of Sacramento 2024a). An increase of 12 residents would be minor and would not constitute a substantial population growth.

###### Agricultural Resources

The potential impact of development under the 2040 General Plan on agricultural resources was evaluated in Master EIR Chapter 4.2. In addition to evaluating the effect of the General Plan on sites within the City, the Master EIR noted that, to the extent the 2040 General Plan accommodates future growth within the City limits, the conversion of farmland outside the City limits is minimized. The Master EIR concluded that the impact of the 2040 General Plan on agricultural resources within the City was less than significant.

The project site is in an area that forms the boundary between an agricultural area of the City that may be in active agricultural production and expansive urban development. The project site and adjacent agricultural land to the west are designated as Farmland of Local Importance, but do not contain soils designated as Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance; U.S. Department of Agriculture

Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] 2025; refer to Figure 5 in Appendix A for Important Farmland mapping). The site is not zoned for agricultural uses, and there are no Williamson Act contracts that affect the project site. Parcels with the Agricultural, A, zoning designation are approximately 680 feet west of the project site. The agricultural lands are limited in size (less than 50 acres, estimated from Sacramento County Assessor Parcel Viewer) and are surrounded by urban development (refer to Figures 3 and 4). The proposed project would develop a parcel designated for such uses and which would be consistent with existing surrounding development. The project would not result in off-site improvements or other components that would preclude the nearby agricultural lands from such uses. No existing timber-harvest uses are located on or in the vicinity of the project site. Development of the site would result in no impact on agricultural resources.

Wildfire

Pursuant to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire and Resources Assessment Program, the City is located within a Local Responsibility Area. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2022). Furthermore, the project site is located within a developed area where substantial wildland-urban interface does not exist. Thus, the risk of wildfire at the project site is minimal. The Master EIR does not identify any significant impacts related to wildfire risk. Based on the above, the proposed project would not create a substantial fire risk for existing development in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to wildfire.

**2. AESTHETICS**

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

**Background and Setting**

The project site is within an area of the City featuring a mix of urban development, vacant land, and agricultural parcels. The project site is bound by Northgate Boulevard to the northeast and Rosin Court to the southeast and southwest. An existing KFC restaurant is directly northwest of the project site, and McDonald's southeast of the project site, across Rosin Court. Existing development east of Northgate Boulevard includes various highway-serving businesses, including fast food restaurants and hotels, which transition to office buildings further east. A residential neighborhood is approximately 500 feet south of the project site, with no existing buildings or other structures between the project site and residences. Properties west of the project site are undeveloped and feature agricultural and vacant lands. Additional residential neighborhoods are west of the undeveloped parcels, approximately 0.4-mile west of the project site. Refer to Figures 1, 3 and 4 in Appendix A for the surrounding public roadways and land uses.

Public views of the project site include views from motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling along Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court past the project site. Distant views of the project site would also be possible from the roadway forming the eastern boundary of the residential neighborhood approximately 0.4 mile west of the project site (i.e., Parkechannel Way and Aspenparke Way). Private views could be possible from the residences west and south of the project site, where existing walls and fences do not obstruct the view.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the State Scenic Highway System which provides guidance and assists local government agencies with the process to officially designate scenic highways (Caltrans 2018). There are no designated scenic highways in or near the City.

As described in the 2040 General Plan, important scenic resources in the City include major natural open space features such as the American River and Sacramento River and their associated parkways. Another important scenic resource is the State Capitol (as defined by the Capitol View Protection Ordinance). Other potential important scenic resources include important historic structures listed on the Sacramento Register of Historic and Cultural Resources, California and/or National Registers. Discovery Park along the American River is 2 miles south of the project site, and the Sacramento River is 3.1 miles southwest of the project site. Midtown Sacramento, containing the State Capitol, is over 3.8 miles southwest of the project site. As described in Section III.5, there are no important historic structures in the vicinity of the project site.

Visually sensitive public locations include viewpoints where a change to the visibility of an important scenic resource, or a visual change to the resource itself, would affect the public. Visually sensitive public locations include public plazas, trails, parks, parkways, or designated publicly available and important scenic corridors (e.g., Capitol View Protection Corridor). The project site does not contain scenic resources and is not located in an area designated as a scenic resource or vista.

## Standards of Significance

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

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

## Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR described the existing visual conditions in the City, and the potential changes to those conditions that could result from development consistent with the 2040 General Plan. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics.

The Master EIR identified potential impacts for light and glare (Impact 4.1-1) and scenic resources (Impact 4.1-2) and concluded that impacts would be less than significant for both.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project create a source of glare that would cause a public hazard or annoyance?
- B. Would the project create a new source of light that would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** According to the Master EIR, the City is mostly built out and a large amount of widespread, ambient light from urban uses already exists. New development permitted under the 2040 General Plan could add lighting similar to the existing urban light sources from any of the following: exterior building lighting, new street lighting, parking lot lights, and headlights of vehicular traffic.

Sensitive land uses would generally be residential uses, especially single- and multi-family residential uses. Areas directly west and south of the project site are currently undeveloped with single-family developments approximately 0.4 mile west of the project site and approximately 500 feet south of the project site. Because there is no intervening development and the surrounding undeveloped landscape is relatively flat with no topographical features between the residential land uses and the project site, these areas were considered sensitive receptors to project-generated light and glare.

The project would develop the currently undeveloped project site with a 24-hour convenience store and fuel station, and associated landscaping, lighting and signage which would introduce a new source of light and glare that could affect the surrounding areas. Project lighting would include a combination of pole-, building- and fuel canopy-mounted fixtures and illuminated signs. Pole lighting would be installed at the project driveways and along the perimeter of the parking areas. Canopy lighting would be installed under the fuel canopy, and the convenience store canopies and wall-mounted luminaires would be installed on the convenience store exterior. All lighting would be required to adhere to the City's lighting standards and Policy LUP-4.6 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses) that ensure that the introduction of higher-intensity mixed-use development along major arterial corridors is compatible with adjacent land uses by requiring specific design features including shielding and casting downward outdoor lighting to reduce light spillover on adjacent properties and glare from the area. Security lighting would comply with City standards and be designed to avoid spill-over illumination on to adjacent streets and properties. Color and black and white illuminance renderings in Appendix D visually depict the extent of illumination originating from the proposed lighting on the project site.

As previously mentioned, the parcels surrounding the project site to the west and south are undeveloped, but the project site is bound by existing highway-serving development directly to the northwest and southeast (e.g., KFC and McDonald's restaurants, respectively) and across Northgate Boulevard from the project site. The lighting associated with the new development would be similar to the existing lighting for the surrounding development and would not result in excessive additional light at the residences west and south of the project site. Furthermore, the residences south of the project site (the nearest residences are approximately 500 feet south) feature existing solid wood and/or masonry privacy fences and/or landscaping which would block lighting associated with development on the project site. The residences west of the project site are 0.4 mile away and the intensity of on-site lighting would dissipate over the distance from the light source to the residential properties. With compliance with the City's lighting standards, the lighting design for the proposed development would not result in a new or more significant

source of glare or lighting spillover. Refer to Photos 2d, 4a and 5 in Appendix C for photographs of the residential properties taken from the roadways surrounding the project site.

Vehicles circulating and exiting the project site, or vehicles parked along the southwestern project site boundary with their headlights on could cast light toward the residential properties. Vehicle circulation would cast temporary light on the surrounding areas which would be consistent with the existing vehicle circulation from the surrounding development. The project design directs headlights from parked cars to the northwest, towards the KFC restaurant, and towards the on-site 7-Eleven convenience store building. Five parking spaces in the southwest corner of the project site are faced outward and the headlights from cars parked in those spots would be directed toward the southwest. The previously mentioned privacy fences and landscaping at the nearest residences south of the project site would block headlight glare. In addition, the intensity of the illumination generated from headlights on the project site would dissipate over the distance of the light source to the residential properties. The Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108 (FMVSS 108) sets an upper cap on headlight intensity at 75,000 candela (49 CFR 571.108). Assuming vehicles parked in the southwest portion of the project site direct high beams outward, the light intensity at the residences west of the project site would be approximately 0.18 lux (lux = candela/distance in meters<sup>2</sup>; therefore, 75,000 candela/645.3<sup>2</sup> = 0.18 lux), which is essentially near darkness (about 1.68% of a foot-candle). Headlights from vehicles circulating and parked on the project site would not result in a significant source of glare or excessive additional light at the residences west and south of the project site.

The convenience store and fueling station would not use building materials that may cause glare impacts such as reflective glass that exceeds 50 percent of any building surface, mirrored glass, black glass that exceeds 25 percent of any surface of a building, or metal building materials that exceed 50 percent of any street-facing surface of a primarily residential building. The convenience store would feature neutral shades with cedar-colored accent panels on the store front and black metal accent elsewhere. Windows would be limited to the front of the store and the back entrance and would be shielded by black metal canopies.

Based on the above, while the proposed project has the potential to introduce new sources of light from security lighting, exterior building lighting, parking lot lights, and the headlights of vehicles entering, exiting or circulating the project site, the type and intensity of light and glare would be similar to that of the surrounding industrial and commercial developments and would be consistent with what has been anticipated for the site for the 2040 General Plan and analyzed in the Master EIR. The proposed building materials would not introduce significant amounts of glare. Therefore, the proposed project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects related to sources or light and glare.

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of any significant visual resources such as the American River, Sacramento River, State Capitol, or any public trails. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to changing the visual character of such resources.

As previously mentioned, the project site is in an area featuring a mix of urban development, vacant lands, and agricultural parcels. Existing highway-serving commercial development surrounds the project site to the northwest, southeast, and east of Northgate Boulevard, and at its intersection with Rosin Court. While parcels west of the project site are undeveloped, the area is relatively small, is surrounded by urban development, and is set back from the primary arterial through the area – Northgate Boulevard. Therefore, urban development defines the existing visual character of the project area as experienced by motorists and pedestrians traveling through the area.

The Sacramento City Code Title 17 Planning and Development Code identifies the project site as being zoned for highway serving commercial use. The proposed convenience store design would feature neutral shades with cedar-colored accent panels on the store front and black metal accent elsewhere. The character and quality of the proposed project, including building heights and architectural style, would be consistent with surrounding development. Project landscaping would further reduce the visual effect of the development and would soften views of the development from the surrounding public roadways and adjacent properties. The plant material for the proposed landscape design was selected based on the geographical location and local climate and is typical for the region. Project signs for the proposed convenience store and fuel station would be consistent with other business signs in the area (including the KFC restaurant and McDonald's adjacent to the project site) and would be consistent with City of Sacramento standards. The proposed project would be compatible with the existing commercial land uses surrounding the site and would not contribute to the degradation of the visual character of the site and the surrounding areas. Potential impacts to the visual character of the site and its surroundings associated with the development of the site with highway-serving commercial uses have been previously analyzed in the Master EIR,

and the proposed project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Aesthetics beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**3. AIR QUALITY**

<b>Issues:</b>	<b>Effect will be studied in the EIR</b>	<b>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</b>	<b>No additional significant environmental effect</b>
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: A) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
B) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		X	
C) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X
D) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X

**Background and Setting**

An Air Quality Technical Report was prepared for the project by RCH Group, Inc. (RCH; RCH 2026). The analysis contained in this section is based on that report, which is included in full as Appendix E to this Initial Study. Refer to Appendix E for the regulatory background and a detailed description of the methods and analysis. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts are discussed in Section III.8 of this Initial Study. The local air quality agency is the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The air quality analysis includes a review of the project’s impacts on criteria pollutant emissions such as carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds (VOC) as reactive organic gases (ROG), particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (coarse or PM10), and particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers (fine or PM2.5).

Climate and Meteorology

The climate of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) is characterized by hot dry summers and mild rainy winters. During the year, the temperature may range from 20 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs usually in the 90s and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches. The prevailing winds are moderate in strength and vary from moist breezes from the south to dry land flows from the north. The mountains surrounding the Sacramento Valley create a barrier to airflow, which can trap air pollutants in the valley when certain meteorological conditions are right, and a temperature inversion (areas of warm air overlying areas of cooler air) exists. Air stagnation in the autumn and early winter occurs when large high-pressure cells lie over the valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduces the influx of outside air and allows pollutants to become concentrated in the air.

The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with increased levels of smoke or when temperature inversions trap cool air, fog, and pollutants near the ground. The ozone season (May through October) in the SVAB is characterized by stagnant morning air or light winds with the breeze arriving in the afternoon out of the southwest from the San Francisco Bay. Usually, the evening breeze transports the airborne pollutants to the north out of the SVAB. During about half of the days from July to September, however, a phenomenon called the “Schultz Eddy” prevents this from occurring. Instead of allowing for the prevailing wind patterns to move north carrying the pollutants out of the valley, the Schultz Eddy causes the wind pattern and pollutants to circle back southward. This phenomenon’s effect exacerbates the pollution levels in the area and increases the likelihood of violating the federal and State air quality standards (SMAQMD 2020a).

### Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

All projects under the jurisdiction of SMAQMD are required to comply with applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations. Rules and regulations related to the proposed project could include, but are not limited to, Rule 201 (General Permit Requirements), Rule 402 (Nuisance), Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), Rule 404 (Particulate Matter), Rule 414 (Water Heaters, Boilers and Process Heaters Rated Less Than 1,000,000 British Thermal Units per Hour), Rule 417 (Wood Burning Appliances), Rule 442 (Architectural Coatings), Rule 453 (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials), Rule 460 (Adhesives and Sealants), Rule 902 (Asbestos) and CCR requirements related to the registration of portable equipment and anti-idling.

The proposed project includes fueling pump stations and the SMAQMD requires all gasoline dispensing facilities to be equipped with a Phase I and Phase II vapor recovery system (Rule 449: Transfer of Gasoline into Vehicle Fuel Tanks). The proposed fuel stations would be subject to SMAQMD rules and regulations which govern the storage and distribution of gasoline. Vapor recovery systems collect gasoline vapors that would otherwise escape into the air during bulk fuel delivery (Phase I) or fuel storage and vehicle refueling (Phase II). Phase I refers to control methods used for reducing emissions when tank trucks unload into underground storage tanks. Phase I vapor recovery system components include the couplers that connect tanker trucks to the underground tanks, spill containment drain valves, overfill prevention devices, and vent pressure/vacuum valves. A Phase I vapor balance system employs a vapor return hose which returns gasoline vapor displaced from the underground storage tank to the tank truck storage compartment being emptied. Phase II vapor recovery system components include gasoline dispensers, nozzles, piping, break away, hoses, face plates, vapor processors, and system monitors. Phase II refers to control methods used for reducing vehicle/equipment refueling emissions. The Phase II systems are designed to convey the vapors displaced from vehicle fuel tanks to underground storage tanks vapor space. Both balance systems and assist systems were assumed to capture 95 percent control of the vapors released from the vehicle fuel tank, with an overall efficiency of 90 percent. In addition, all gasoline will be stored underground with valves installed on the tank vent pipes to further control gasoline vapor emissions.

### Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are children, elderly, asthmatics and others who are at a heightened risk of negative health outcomes due to air pollution exposure. The locations where these sensitive receptors congregate are considered sensitive receptor locations. Sensitive receptor locations may include residences, hospitals, schools, and day care centers.

### Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed project would result in any of the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of 2040 General Plan policies:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting substantial number of people.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines states that the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the above determinations. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has established significance thresholds to assess the regional and localized impacts of project-related air pollutant emissions. The significance thresholds are updated, as needed, to appropriately represent the most current technical information and attainment status in Sacramento County.

Table 1 presents the most current significance thresholds, including regional daily thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational emissions; maximum incremental cancer risk and hazard indices for toxic air contaminants (TAC); and maximum ambient concentrations for exposure of sensitive receptors to localized pollutants. A project with daily emission rates, risk values, or concentrations below these thresholds is generally considered to have a less than significant effect on air quality (SMAQMD 2020b).

**Table 1. Sacramento Municipal Air Quality Management District Thresholds of Significance**

Pollutant	Construction (pounds per day)	Operation (pounds per day)
ROG	None	65
NOX	85	65
PM10	801	801
PM2.5	82	821
Pollutant	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk	Chronic & Acute Hazard Index
TAC's	≥ 10 in 1 million	≥ 1.0 (project increment)
Criteria Pollutant	Ambient 1-hour Average	Ambient Long-Term Average
NO2	1-hour average ≥ 0.18 ppm	Annual average ≥ 0.03 ppm
CO	1-hour average ≥ 20.0 ppm (state)	8-hour average ≥ 9.0 ppm (state/federal)
SO2	1-hour average ≥ 0.075 ppm	24-hour average ≥ 0.04 ppm
Lead	NA	1.5 µg/m3 30-day average

Source: SMAQMD 2020b

<sup>1</sup> PM thresholds are zero (0) unless all feasible Best Available Control Practices/Best Management Practices are applied. lbs./day = pounds per day; VOC = volatile organic compound; NOX = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM10 = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less; PM2.5 = fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less; SOX = sulfur oxides; TACs = toxic air contaminants; CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; NO2 = nitrogen dioxide; ppm = parts per million; µg/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter

### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR addressed the potential effects of the 2040 General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthy pollutant concentrations. See Master EIR, Chapter 4.3.

The Master EIR analyzed whether implementation of the 2040 General Plan could conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan in Impact 4.3-1. The Master EIR concluded that the growth projections used for the 2040 General Plan assume that growth in population, vehicle use, and other source categories would occur at rates that are consistent with the rates used to develop the SMAQMD's attainment plans. The 2040 General Plan would increase the City's sustainability efforts that reduce motor vehicle use and energy consumption through the implementation of various policies.

The goals and policies of the 2040 General Plan would be consistent with the applicable transportation control measures included in the SMAQMD attainment plan, which would reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and provide transportation alternatives. The 2040 General Plan would be consistent with the air quality attainment plans and with the required 2040 General Plan policies along with the implementing action aimed at reduction of construction and operational criteria air pollutant emissions. Future development under the 2040 General Plan would also be required to comply with local regulations and general policies to ensure odors would not affect a substantial number of people and thus would result in a less than significant impact on air quality. No mitigation measures were included in the Master EIR for Air Quality.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** At the federal level, the Sacramento metropolitan area is designated as severe nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone ambient air quality standards (AAQS), non-attainment for the 24-hour PM2.5 AAQS, and attainment or unclassified for all other criteria pollutant AAQS. At the State level, the area is designated as a serious nonattainment area for the 1-hour ozone AAQS, nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone AAQS, nonattainment for the 24-hour PM10 AAQS, and attainment or unclassified for all other State AAQS.

As a part of the SVAB federal ozone nonattainment area, the SMAQMD works with the other local air districts within the Sacramento area to develop a regional air quality management plan under the Federal Clean Air Act requirement. The regional air quality management plan covers Sacramento County and is called the State Implementation Plan which describes and demonstrates how the county, as well as the Sacramento nonattainment area, would attain the required federal ozone standard by the proposed attainment deadline. In accordance with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act, SMAQMD, along with the other air districts in the region, prepared the Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Ozone Attainment Plan) in December 2008. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) determined that the Ozone Attainment Plan met Federal Clean Air Act requirements and approved the Plan on March 26, 2009, as a revision to the State Implementation Plan. An update to the plan, the 2017 Revisions to the Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (2017 Ozone Attainment Plan), was prepared and adopted by the CARB on November 16, 2017. An additional update to the plan was prepared and adopted by CARB on October 15, 2018, and known as the 2018 Updates to the California State Implementation Plan.

As discussed under Question B, below, the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD's significance thresholds for construction and operations; therefore, the project supports the primary goals of the applicable air quality plan.

- B. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** The project's emissions of criteria pollutants as result of construction and operation of the proposed project were evaluated using the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) CalEEMod (California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2022.1).

*Construction*

Construction activities would result in generation of criteria pollutants including particulate matter from fugitive dust (PM10 and PM 2.5) and combustion emission of air pollutants (including ROG, NOX, PM10, PM2.5, and CO) primarily from operation of off-road equipment. Using standard fuel consumption estimates and based on the estimated volume of soil import to the project site, construction activities would require approximately 19,750 gallons of diesel fuel. Table 2 provides the estimated daily construction emissions that would be associated with construction of the proposed project and compares those emissions to the significance thresholds. All construction-related emissions would be below the significance thresholds without mitigation, and exhaust emissions would be further reduced by implementation of which is required to reduce health impacts as discussed under Question C.

**Table 2. Estimated Daily Maximum Construction Emissions (pounds)**

Condition	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO
Construction	8.85	13.5	7.85	4.01	15.1
Significance Threshold	--	85	80	82	--
Significant Impact? (Yes/No)	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1.0

CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen oxide; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers (fine); PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (coarse); ROG = reactive organic gases

As shown in Table 1, proposed project construction emissions would be well below SMAQMD's significance thresholds; however, regardless of emission levels SMAQMD considers construction emissions of PM2.5 and PM10 to be significant unless Basic Construction Emission Control Practices recommended by the SMAQMD are implemented. Non-compliance with these practices would result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would require compliance with SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, and impacts associated with emissions of criteria pollutants during construction would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

*Operation*

Emissions generated during operation of the proposed project would be primarily VOC/ROG emissions resulting from fuel loading, breathing (both related to the underground storage tanks), refueling, and spillage (both related to the fuel pumps). The following are additional details concerning these emission points:

- Loading emissions occur when a cargo tank truck unloads gasoline to the storage tanks.
- At the gasoline station, storage tank vapors are emitted from the vent pipe during the initial fuel transfer period. These emissions are significantly reduced when the vent pipe includes a pressure/vacuum valve.
- Gasoline vapors are emitted from the storage tank vent pipe due to temperature and pressure changes within the storage tank vapor space.
- During the refueling process, gasoline vapors are emitted at the vehicle/nozzle interface.
- Spillage emissions occur from the spills during vehicle fueling.

CAPCOA's Gasoline Service Station Industry-wide Risk Assessment Guidelines were used to estimate VOC/ROG emissions that would result from the proposed gasoline station (CAPCOA 2022). The calculations are based on maximum hourly gasoline throughput and typical annual gasoline throughput based on the maximum vehicle volume and number of fuel pumps with underground storage tanks and vapor recovery systems, and 90 percent overall control efficiency. The project would include a total of 11 fuel pumps. Natural gas would not be used for the convenience store during operation.

According to the California Annual Retail Fuel Outlet Report Results, the average annual throughput of gasoline fuel was 1,358,299 gallons and the average annual throughput of diesel fuel was 365,814 gallons during 2023. According to the California Annual Retail Fuel Outlet Report Results, the maximum annual throughput of gasoline fuel was 1,668,383 gallons and the maximum annual throughput of diesel fuel was 388,767 gallons between 2010 and 2023 (California Energy Commission[CEC] 2023). It is anticipated that for the proposed project, the throughput for both gasoline and diesel would be lower than these values.

The proposed project is estimated to generate 1,374 gross daily trips, with 87 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 112 trips during the p.m. peak hour (501,510 trips per year and 1,806,350 vehicle miles per year; DKS 2018 with adjustments made for current number of fuel positions, see Section III.14). Due to the project's location and proximity to I-80; however, the project trips were adjusted for diverted trips (e.g. trips by travelers in the area making minor adjustments from their original route to visit the proposed project) and pass-by trips (e.g., trips to the proposed project by travelers not adjusting the original route). The proposed project would generate 563 net daily trips, with 33 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 49 trips during the p.m. peak hour (205,495 trips per year and 1,776,320 vehicle miles per year). The estimated annual vehicle fuel usage based on net trip generation is approximately 47,360 gallons of gasoline and 15,320 gallons of diesel.<sup>1</sup>

Estimated daily operational emissions that would be associated with the proposed project are presented in Table 3, and estimated annual operations are presented in Table 4. For both scenarios, the estimated emissions are compared to thresholds of significance. As indicated, the estimated proposed project operational emissions would be below the significance thresholds and would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

**Table 3. Estimated Daily Operational Emissions (pounds)**

Condition	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO
Mobile	4.83	2.18	3.55	0.93	23.7
Area	0.15	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.21
Fuel Pumps/Tanks	4.72				
<b>Total Operations</b>	<b>9.71</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>23.9</b>
Significance Threshold	65	65	80	82	--
Significant Impact? (Y/N)	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1.0

CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen oxide; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers (fine); PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (coarse); ROG = reactive organic gases

<sup>1</sup> Fuel usage is estimated using the CalEEMod output for CO<sub>2</sub>, and a 8.91 kgCO<sub>2</sub>/gallon (gasoline) and 10.15 kgCO<sub>2</sub>/gallon (diesel) conversion factor, [https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/co2\\_vol\\_mass.php](https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/co2_vol_mass.php)

**Table 4. Estimated Annual Operational Emissions (tons)**

Condition	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	CO
Mobile	0.79	0.37	0.63	0.17	3.99
Area	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.03
Fuel Pumps/Tanks	0.86				
<b>Total Operations</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>4.01</b>
Significance Threshold	--	--	14.6	15.0	--
Significant Impact? (Y/N)	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1.0

CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen oxide; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers (fine); PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (coarse); ROG = reactive organic gases

C. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Sensitive receptors are described as residences, schools, day-care centers, playgrounds, medical facilities, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions (medical patients or elderly persons/athletes/students/children) that may be adversely affected by changes in air quality. Health risk from exposure to air pollutants is evaluated based on the potential for exposure to TAC, such as diesel particulate matter and crystalline silica, the pollutant which poses the most significant threat to human health. TAC is a set of airborne pollutants that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health and are separated into carcinogens and non-carcinogens (i.e., cancer and non-cancer hazards). State and local regulatory programs are intended to limit exposure to TAC and the associated health risk. Project impacts related to increased health risk can occur either by introducing a new sensitive receptor, such as a residential use, in proximity to an existing source of TAC or by introducing a new source of TAC, such as industrial activities, with the potential to adversely affect existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.

The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) prepared for the project was conducted using the significance levels identified by the SQAMD (SQAMD 2020), and in accordance with the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and CAPCOA's guidance (OEHHA 2015; CARB 2022). The HRA evaluated the potential of the project to result in an increase in cancer for children and adults and evaluated the potential for adverse health impacts associated with acute and chronic exposure to non-cancer hazards. Cancer risk is expressed in the number of people likely to develop cancer per million people. Non-cancer hazards are expressed as a health index based on risks to organ systems. The HRA evaluated the potential risks of the project on the health of sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site. The nearest residential sensitive receptors are the residences south of the project site, with the nearest sensitive receptor 820 feet from the fuel station island. Risk to employees at the nearby KFC and McDonald's restaurants were also evaluated.

*Construction*

As presented in Table 5, the HRA indicated that construction of the proposed project would remain well below thresholds of cancer risk for children and adults at the nearby residences and for adult employees at the nearby KFC and McDonald's restaurants. Risks associated with non-cancer hazards under chronic exposure conditions would also remain below the thresholds. No acute exposure conditions thresholds have been established for construction.

**Table 5. Estimated Un-Mitigated Health Impacts for Existing Residences and Off-site Employees During Construction**

Condition	Cancer Risk per million people (child/adult)	Non-Cancer Hazard Index
Residences	2.39/0.11	<0.01
Off-site Employees	NA/0.94	0.04
Significance Threshold	10	1.0
<b>Significant Impact? (Yes/No)</b>	No	No

Construction of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts and no mitigation would be required.

### *Operation*

CAPCOA's Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects states that siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) should be avoided (CAPCOA 2009). A 50-foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities, such as the proposed project. As previously mentioned, the nearest residence is approximately 820 feet from the nearest fuel island. The KFC restaurant is approximately 60 feet northwest of the project site boundary. The proposed project is well beyond the recommended separation distance, which would reduce the potential for negative health impacts during operation.

CAPCOA's Gasoline Service Station Industry-wide Risk Assessment Guidelines (CAPCOA 2022) was used to estimate health impacts from operation of the proposed fuel station. For the nearest sensitive receptor, the estimated cancer risk would be 0.15 per million people, which is well below the significance threshold of 10 per million people. For the nearest off-site employees at the nearby KFC and McDonald's restaurants, the estimated cancer risk would be 0.14 per million people, which is also well below the significance threshold. The potential health impact associated with cancer risk from operation of the proposed project would therefore be less than significant.

The potential health risks of non-cancer hazards were evaluated for acute and chronic exposure during operation. The health risk indexes would be 0.27 for acute exposure and less than 0.01 for chronic exposure at the nearest sensitive receptors. Both conditions would be below the threshold of one. Therefore, the health risk to sensitive receptors during operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

- D. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Though offensive odors from stationary and mobile sources rarely cause any physical harm, they remain unpleasant and can lead to public distress, generating citizen complaints to local governments. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the sensitivity of receptors. Generally, odor emissions are highly dispersive, especially in areas with higher average wind speeds. However, odors disperse less quickly during inversions or during calm conditions, which hamper vertical mixing and dispersion.

Potential localized odor sources associated with operation of the proposed project could originate from fumes from the diesel exhaust from trucks or VOC emissions from the proposed fuel station. However, odor emissions are highly dispersive, especially in areas with higher average wind speeds. Therefore, proposed project odor impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

#### **AQ-1: Basic Construction Emission Control Practices for Fugitive Dust**

During construction, the contractor shall implement Basic Construction Emission Control Practices to control fugitive dust in accordance with SMAQMD Rule 403. These practices include:

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks traveling along freeways or major roadways shall be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible track out mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved will be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Minimize idling time by either shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing time of idling to 5 minutes. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

## Findings

All additional potentially significant environmental effects of the project relating to Air Quality can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Air Quality beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<b>Issues:</b>	<b>Effect will be studied in the EIR</b>	<b>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</b>	<b>No additional significant environmental effect</b>
Would the project:  A) Create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?			X
B) Result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal species?		X	
C) Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?		X	

**Background and Setting**

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

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

A Biological Resources Evaluation (BRE) was prepared for the project by Stringer Biological Consulting, Inc. (SBC; SBC 2025). The discussion of biological resources in this section is based on that report, which is included in full as Appendix F to this Initial Study. The BRE included a desktop review, surveys and an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Appendix F for the regulatory background and a detailed description of the methods and analysis.

Desktop Review

In order to evaluate special-status species and/or their habitats with the potential to occur in the project area and/or be impacted by the proposed project and the likelihood of sensitive habitats (including aquatic resources) to occur in the project area, SBR reviewed the following information sources for the project site and vicinity: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) information for Planning and Consultation database; California Native Plant Society online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants; California Natural Diversity Database (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database; California Wildlife Habitat Relationships system; USFWS National Wetlands Inventory; GIS files of designated critical habitat from the USFWS Critical Habitat Portal website; CDFW publications regarding State and Federally Listed Plants and Animals of California and Special Animals Lists; aerial imagery of the project site and vicinity; 7.5’ topographic quadrangle of the project site and surrounding quads.

### Surveys

A reconnaissance survey was conducted on September 25, 2025, by SBC Principal Biologist, Stephen Stringer. The reconnaissance survey was conducted to characterize and map the biological habitats and to document existing biological resources within the project site. During the reconnaissance survey, the project site was searched for the presence of potential wetlands and other aquatic resources, special-status species and their habitats, and sensitive natural communities. Trees and shrubs in the area were investigated for nests, and the ground was investigated for mammal burrows and evidence of use by burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*). A complete inventory of vascular plants identifiable at the time of the survey was conducted and all plant and animal species observed in and near the project site were documented.

### Results

The project site has been historically and routinely disturbed and was heavily used due to the nearby I-80 interchange, hotels and restaurants, and adjacent fast-food restaurants. Vehicles and pedestrians were using the adjacent roadway ROWs and homeless encampments were observed on the vacant properties west of Rosin Court. The habitat types/vegetation community in the project site is ruderal/disturbed (1.3 acres) and developed (0.1 acre). The ruderal/disturbed habitat was dominated by non-native weedy species that rapidly colonize areas of recent disturbance and bare ground. The project site had evidence of prior ground disturbance and as a result, much of the project site is compacted or has gravel and other remnant construction materials mixed into the surface soils. The developed areas of the project site feature sidewalks and paved areas associated with Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court. No aquatic habitats were observed during the reconnaissance survey.

Thirty-nine special-status wildlife species, 15 special-status plant species, and seven sensitive natural communities were identified during the database queries and desktop review and were evaluated for their potential to occur in the project site or otherwise be affected by the project. Based on the results of the evaluation, no special-status plant species have the potential to occur on the project site or be impacted by the proposed project. The only special-status species with the potential to occur on the project site or be impacted by the proposed project are burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*; candidate endangered under the California Endangered Species Act [CESA] and species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW]) and Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*; threatened under CESA and a species of special concern to CDFW). The project site and immediate vicinity provide suitable habitat for nesting migratory birds and raptors. No sensitive natural communities or wildlife corridors occur within or near the project site.

The project site is located within the plan area of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP). The NBHCP establishes a multi-species conservation program to minimize and mitigate the expected loss of habitat values and incidental take of covered species that would result from urban development, operation and maintenance of irrigation and drainage systems, and certain activities associated with the Natomas Basin Conservancy (TNBC) management of its system of reserves established under the NBHCP.

### Standards of Significance

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be significant if any of the following conditions or potential thereof, would result with implementation of the proposed project:

- Creation of a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected.
- Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal.
- Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands).

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

- Listed as endangered or threatened under FESA (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under CESA (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 CDFW;
- Plants or animals that meet the definition of rare or endangered under CEQA.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

Chapter 4.4 of the Master EIR evaluated the effects of the 2040 General Plan on biological resources within the City. The Master EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special-status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat. Policies in the 2040 General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the 2040 General Plan. Policy ERC-2.1 calls for the City to preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors and other riparian resources; and Policy ERC-2.2 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate.

The Master EIR concluded that policies in the 2040 General Plan, combined with compliance with the CESA, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, NBHCP (when applicable) and CEQA would minimize the impacts on special-status species to a less than significant level (see Impact 4.4-1), and that the 2040 General Plan policies, along with similar compliance with local, state and federal regulation would reduce impacts to a less than significant level for habitat for special-status invertebrates, birds, amphibians and reptiles, mammals and fish (Impacts 4.4-3-6).

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

The 2040 General Plan calls for the City to preserve and conserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals and drainage ditches that support riparian resources (Policy ERC-2.1), biological resources, and wetlands (Policy ERC-2.2).

Given the extent of urban development designated in the 2040 General Plan, the preservation and/or restoration of riparian habitat would primarily occur outside of the City limits. The Master EIR concluded that, with project specific analysis, there would be a less than significant impact.

No feasible mitigation measures are available to address the 2040 General Plan's impacts on biological resources, and implementation of the 2040 General Plan would lead to a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on biological resources.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project create a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The project site is proposed to be developed with a fuel station, convenience store, and landscaping. Hazardous materials on the site could include concrete, oils, gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants and solvents used during construction activities affecting the entire project site and during operation of the proposed convenience store and fuel station. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure. Use of such materials would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous material. No sensitive plants have the potential to occur on the site, and with implementation of the applicable regulations risk of exposure to wildlife would be avoided. The project would result in no additional significant environmental effect on sensitive plant or animal populations related to exposure to hazardous materials.

- B. Would the project result in substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal species?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** Based on the findings of the BRE prepared for the project, the project site contains potentially suitable habitat for burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and nesting migratory birds and raptors. Potential impacts on individual nesting birds and occupied nests could occur, if present during construction. Loss of suitable burrowing owl habitat would also occur if the project site is occupied by the species;

and loss of potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would occur if the species nests in the area. Potentially significant impacts to burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and nesting birds would be mitigated to less than significant. Potential impacts of the proposed project are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The project site is located within the NBHCP plan area which requires preconstruction surveys prior to construction activities within the plan area and payment of land cover impact fees. Refer to Question C for additional discussion and mitigation requirements specific to the NBHCP.

#### *Special-Status Plants*

As previously described, the database searches identified 15 special-status plant species known to occur in the region. The project site is highly disturbed and does not support native or naturalized habitat communities. The project site does not contain potentially suitable habitat or specialized soils to support special-status plants. No special-status plants were observed during the biological reconnaissance survey. Areas surrounding the project site are regularly disturbed and/or developed with urban land uses and would not support special-status plants near the project site. The proposed project would not impact special-status plants or their habitats.

#### *Special-Status Wildlife*

Burrowing owl is candidate for listing as endangered under CESA and is a CDFW species of special concern. In addition to a variety of suitable natural habitats, burrowing owls can use urban habitats such as at the margins of airports and golf courses and in vacant urban lots. They forage in grasslands and open areas, and nest in burrows in the ground which commonly consist of ground squirrel burrows or artificial burrows such as abandoned pipes or culverts. No burrowing owls or their sign (i.e., pellets, feathers, whitewash) were observed during the biological reconnaissance survey. Routine ground disturbance of the project site renders portions of the site less hospitable to burrowing owls; however, numerous ground squirrel burrows are present in the project site and provide potentially suitable habitat for the species. As described in the BRE, the species has been documented nesting approximately 1,500 feet northeast of the project site, with potentially suitable habitat still present in some areas. Burrowing owls could be present in the vicinity of the project site and could use the project site for foraging, temporary refugia, overwintering or nesting. Potential impacts to burrowing owls as a result of the proposed project include loss of 1.3 acres of marginal foraging habitat if the species is present in the area, and potential disturbance of occupied burrows, if present. If burrowing owls occupy ground squirrel burrows in the project site, construction activities could result in displacement of owls from their burrows and/or impacts to nesting owls. Project activities such as clearing and grubbing, grading, or other earthwork during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) could result in injury or mortality of eggs and chicks directly through destruction or indirectly through forced nest abandonment due to noise and other disturbances. Impacts on burrowing owls would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires conducting protocol-level pre-construction surveys to determine burrowing owl use of the project site. If burrowing owls occur in the project site, measures to avoid impacts to individual owls and occupied nests would be implemented as outlined in the mitigation measure. As described under Question C, below, the project site is within the NBHCP area, which requires payment of land cover impact fees. Payment of those fees would provide compensatory mitigation for the loss of potentially suitable marginal habitat for burrowing owl. Impacts on burrowing owl would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Swainson's hawk is listed as threatened under CESA and is a CDFW species of special concern. Swainson's hawk is a breeding-season migrant in California, with populations largest in the Sacramento Valley. The species nests in large trees in riparian, upland and agricultural areas, and forage in surrounding areas with open, low vegetation and abundant small animals as prey. No trees occur on the project site; therefore, the proposed project would not remove potential nest trees. The project site is too small to represent any significant foraging opportunities; however, suitable nest trees are present 0.1 mile north and 0.25 mile east of the project site. The closest documented occurrence is from 2002 with an active nest reported 1.7 miles north of the project site (SBC 2025). Therefore, while the project site does not provide nesting opportunities, Swainson's hawk nesting in the region could use the project site for foraging. Potential impacts to Swainson's hawk as a result of the proposed project include loss of 1.3 acres of marginal foraging habitat if the species is present in the area. Furthermore, noise, lights and commotion associated with construction activities during the breeding season (March 15 through September 15) have the potential to disrupt active nests within 0.5-mile of the project site, if present, which may result in abandonment of eggs or young or forced fledging due to the disturbance. Impacts on Swainson's hawk would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires conducting protocol-level pre-construction surveys to determine Swainson's hawk use of the project area for nesting. If active Swainson's hawk nests occur within 0.5-mile of the project site, measures to avoid impacts to individual Swainson's hawk and active nests would be implemented as outlined in the mitigation measure. As previously mentioned, the project is within the NBHCP area and payment of land cover impact fees would be required (refer to the discussion under Question C, below). Swainson's hawk is a

species covered under the NBHCP; therefore, payment of those fees would provide compensatory mitigation for the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. Impacts on Swainson's hawk would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### *Nesting Birds*

The project site and immediate vicinity provide potentially suitable nesting habitat for common raptors, migratory birds and other nesting birds common to agricultural and urbanized areas, such as mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), and killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*). Removal of trees and shrubs containing active nests during construction activities throughout the entire project site would potentially result in destruction of eggs and/or chicks; noise, dust, and other anthropogenic stressors in the vicinity of an active nest could lead to forced nest abandonment and mortality of eggs and/or chicks. Furthermore, there is a low potential that birds could nest on the ground. Destruction of eggs or chicks because of project activities would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code and the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and would be a significant impact and mitigation would be required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds. Impacts on nesting birds would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- C. Would the project affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands)?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** Potential impacts to natural resources of concern are discussed in the following paragraphs. The project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement corridors, jurisdictional waters or trees. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the requirements of the NBHCP with mitigation incorporated.

#### *Riparian Habitat*

The Master EIR evaluated impacts on riparian habitat in the City. The project site does not contain riparian habitat. No impacts to riparian habitat would occur as a result of the proposed project.

#### *Sensitive Natural Communities*

CDFW identifies sensitive communities based on limited distribution, high wildlife value, include sensitive species and/or are particularly susceptible to disturbance. The ruderal/disturbed habitat and developed areas on the project site are not considered natural communities and do not contain vegetation alliances ranked by CDFW as sensitive and are not limited in distribution or of high wildlife value. No sensitive natural communities occur on the project site and no impacts to sensitive natural communities would occur as a result of the proposed project.

#### *Wildlife Movement Corridors*

The project site is a relatively small patch of disturbed habitat that is primarily surrounded by urban development and roadways, including I-80. The project site does not provide an opportunity to link two or more larger areas of similar wildlife habitat and allow for physical and genetic exchange between animal populations that would otherwise be isolated. As a result, it is not considered a wildlife movement corridor. No impacts to wildlife movement corridors would occur as a result of the proposed project.

#### *Jurisdictional Waters*

The project site does not contain aquatic habitat, and potentially jurisdictional features were not observed in or near the project site. Impacts to jurisdictional waters would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

#### *Trees*

Sacramento City Code Section 12.56 regulates impacts to and removal of native oaks (*Quercus spp.*), buckeyes (*Aesculus californicus*), or sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*) having a DSH of 12 inches or more, or any tree having a DSH of 24 inches or more, on undeveloped private parcels inside the City limits or any other type of property such as commercial, industrial, and apartments, or any tree with a DSH of 32 inches or greater on a property with an existing single-family or duplex dwelling. There are no existing trees in the project site or adjacent roadway ROWs. Impacts to trees would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

#### *Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan*

The NBHCP pertains to the project site. As described under Question B, above, the proposed project would result in potential impacts to nesting burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and nesting birds and their habitats. Burrowing owl and Swainson's hawk are covered species in the NBHCP. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and -2 would require species-specific protocol pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures to reduce potentially significant impacts on nesting burrowing owls and Swainson's hawk as a result of the proposed project. In addition to the species-specific measures, the NBHCP requires a pre-construction biology survey for all species covered under the NBHCP to be

conducted within six months but no later than 30 days prior to commencement of construction. In addition, the NBHCP requires payment of land use impact fees for development within the plan area. Failure to comply with the requirements of the NBHCP would result in a potentially significant impact. In addition to Mitigation Measures BIO-1, -2, and -3, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and -5 would be implemented in accordance with the NBHCP and would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

### **BIO-1: Burrowing Owl Nest Disturbance**

The following *Measures to Reduce Take of Burrowing Owl* as outlined in the NBHCP (Section V.A.5.h.; City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003) should be implemented to avoid any potential impacts to individual burrowing owls:

- Prior to the initiation of grading or earth disturbing activities, the applicant/developer should hire a qualified biologist to perform a pre-construction survey of the project site to determine if any burrowing owls are using the project site for foraging or nesting. The pre-construction survey should be submitted to the City of Sacramento prior to the developer's commencement of construction activities, and a mitigation program should be developed and agreed to by the City and developer prior to initiation of any physical disturbance in the project site.
- Occupied burrows should not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist approved by the CDFW verifies through non-invasive measures that either: 1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or 2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.
- If nest sites are found, the USFWS and CDFW should be contacted regarding suitable mitigation measures, which may include a 300 foot buffer from the nest site during the breeding season (February 1 - August 31), or a relocation effort for the burrowing owls if the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation or the juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. If on-site avoidance is required, the location of the buffer zone will be determined by a qualified biologist. The developer shall mark the limit of the buffer zone with yellow caution tape, stakes, or temporary fencing. The buffer will be maintained throughout the construction period.
- If relocation of the owls is approved for the site by USFWS and CDFW, the developer should hire a qualified biologist to prepare a plan for relocating the owls to a suitable site. The relocation plan must include: (a) the location of the nest and owls proposed for relocation; (b) the location of the proposed relocation site; (c) the number of owls involved and the time of year when the relocation is proposed to take place; (d) the name and credentials of the biologist who will be retained to supervise the relocation; (e) the proposed method of capture and transport for the owls to the new site; (f) a description of the site preparations at the relocation site (e.g., enhancement of existing burrows, creation of artificial burrows, one-time or long-term vegetation control, etc.); and (g) a description of efforts and funding support proposed to monitor the relocation.
- Relocation options may include passive relocation to another area of the site not subject to disturbance through one-way doors on burrow openings, or construction of artificial burrows in accordance with the CDFW's October 17, 1995, Staff Report on Burrowing Owls Mitigation.
- Where on-site avoidance is not possible, disturbance and/or destruction of burrows should be offset through development of suitable habitat on the Natomas Basin Conservancy upland reserves. Such habitat should include creation of new burrows with adequate foraging area (a minimum of 6.5 acres) or 300 feet radii around the newly created burrows. Additional habitat design and mitigation measures are described in the CDFW's October 17, 1995, Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.

### **BIO-2: Swainson's Hawk Nest Disturbance**

The following *Measures to Reduce Nest Disturbance* as outlined in the NBHCP (Section V.A.5.b.; City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003) shall be implemented to avoid any potential impacts to nesting Swainson's hawk in the vicinity of the project area. Note that although no trees will be removed as a result of the project, the NBHCP measure provided below addresses tree removal as well as other methods of reducing nest disturbance.

- Prior to the commencement of development activities (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading), a survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether any Swainson's hawk nest trees will be removed on-site, or active Swainson's hawk nest sites occur on or within 0.5 mile of the project site. The surveys shall be conducted according to the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee's (May 31, 2000) methodology or updated methodologies, as approved by the USFWS and CDFW, using experienced Swainson's hawk surveyors.
- If breeding Swainson's hawks (i.e. exhibiting nest building or nesting behavior) are identified, no new disturbances (e.g., heavy equipment operation associated with construction) will occur within 0.5 mile of an active nest between March 15 and September 15, or until a qualified biologist, with concurrence by CDFW, has determined that the young have fledged or that the nest is no longer occupied. If the active nest site is located within 0.25 mile of existing urban development, the no new disturbance zone can be limited to the 0.25 mile versus 0.5 mile. Routine disturbances such as agricultural activities, commuter traffic, and routine facility maintenance activities within 0.5 mile of an active nest are not restricted.
- Where disturbance of a Swainson's hawk nest cannot be avoided, such disturbance shall be temporarily avoided (i.e., defer construction activities until after the nesting season) and then, if unavoidable, the nest tree may be destroyed during the non-nesting season. For purposes of this provision the Swainson's hawk nesting season is defined as March 15 to September 15. If a nest tree (any tree that has an active nest in the year the impact is to occur) must be removed, tree removal shall only occur between September 15 and February 1. If a nest tree shall be removed, measures to prevent the loss of nest trees and/or measures to mitigate the loss of Swainson's hawk nest trees from the NBHCP shall be implemented (City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003).
- If a Swainson's hawk nest tree is to be removed and fledglings are present, the tree may not be removed until September 15 or until CDFW has determined that the young have fledged and are no longer dependent upon the nest tree.
- If construction or other project related activities which may cause nest abandonment or forced fledgling are proposed within the 0.25 mile buffer zone, intensive monitoring (funded by the project sponsor) by a qualified biologist will be required. Exact implementation of this measure will be based on specific project-related information.

### **BIO-3: Nesting Birds**

In order to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and Section 3503.5, including their nests and eggs, one of the following shall be implemented:

- Vegetation removal and other ground-disturbing activities associated with construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 when birds are not nesting; or
- If removal of nesting substrate, including trees or woody vines that could support nesting birds, occurs within the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31), then preconstruction surveys will be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of activities to identify active nests within the work area and surrounding 300 feet, wherever potential nesting habitat is present. If construction activities do not commence within 14 days of the nesting bird survey, or activities halt for more than 14 days during the nesting bird season, then an additional survey is required prior to starting or resuming work within the nesting season. If no nesting birds are observed no further mitigation is required.
- If an active nest is located during preconstruction surveys, non-disturbance spatial buffer shall be established around the nest by a qualified biologist to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The radius of the required buffer zone can vary depending on the species, (i.e., 25-100 feet for passerines and 200-300 feet for common raptors), with the dimensions of any required buffer zones to be determined by a qualified biologist. Buffer zones could be reduced if the nest is monitored by a qualified biologist.

- The buffer zone shall be demarcated with high visibility orange construction fencing (or similar highly visible material) and no construction activities or personnel shall be allowed within the buffer zone. The buffer distance will be selected to consider the species present and onsite conditions, such as potential for project activities to disturb or cause abandonment of a nest with nesting birds, eggs, or chicks present. The buffer will remain in place until the chicks have fledged or the nest is deemed to be no longer active by a qualified biologist.

#### **BIO-4: Pre-Construction Survey for NBHCP Covered Species**

The following *Pre-Construction Surveys* as outlined in the NBHCP (Section V.A.1.; City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003) shall be implemented to demonstrate compliance with the NBHCP.

- Not less than 30 days or more than 6 months prior to commencement of construction activities on specific Authorized Development sites in the NBHCP area, a pre-construction survey of the site shall be conducted to determine the status and presence of, and likely impacts to, all Covered Species on the site. However, pre-construction surveys for an individual species may be completed up to one year in advance if the sole period for reliable detection of that species is between May 1 and December 31. The applicant seeking to develop land will be responsible for contracting with qualified biological consultants to carry out the pre-construction surveys, and as necessary, to implement specific take minimization, and other Conservation Measures set forth in the NBHCP and approved by the Wildlife Agencies.
- The results of the pre-construction surveys along with recommended take minimization measures shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted to the Land Use Agency, USFWS, CDFW and TNBC. Based upon the survey results, the Land Use Permittees will identify applicable take avoidance and other site-specific Conservation Measures, consistent with this NBHCP, required to be carried out on the site. The approved pre-construction survey documents and list of Conservation Measures will be submitted by the developer of the Authorized Development project to the applicable Land Use Agency to demonstrate compliance with the NBHCP.

#### **BIO-5: Payment of NBHCP Land Impact Fees**

Prior to issuance of grading permits by the City, the applicant shall provide compensatory mitigation pursuant to the NBHCP mitigation fee requirements (Section VI.B.1.; City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003). The City shall provide the number of acres of the site subject to mitigation fees in the Urban Development Permit \*(i.e., grading permit, notice to proceed, or authorization to commence grading). The area subject to fees shall not include areas exempt from fees or for which fees have been paid as shown on the City's NBHCP Baseline Map, or areas protected as habitat through conveyance of a conservation easement or fee title to TNBC. The Urban Development Permit shall clearly delineate the boundary identifying the area subject to fees.

The applicant shall pay a mitigation fee that funds 0.5 acre of mitigation land acquisition and associated habitat enhancement, management, endowment, administration, monitoring, etc. per 1 acre impacted based on the City's established mitigation fees established fees at the time of payment.

Alternatively, the applicant may donate land to TNBC in lieu of payment of some or all of the acquisition component of the mitigation fee. In such cases, TNBC, USFWS and CDFG will determine which lands are acceptable, based upon reserve acquisition criteria and mitigation requirements noted in Sections IV.C.2 and VI.B.1 of the NBHCP (City of Sacramento, et. al. 2003).

#### **Findings**

All additional potentially significant environmental effects of the project relating to Biological Resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Biological Resources beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<b>Issues:</b>	<b>Effect will be studied in the EIR</b>	<b>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</b>	<b>No additional significant environmental effect</b>
Would the project: A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5?		X	
B) Directly or indirectly destroy or remove an archaeological resource?		X	
C) Disturb any human remains?		X	

**Background and Setting**

The City and the surrounding area are known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout the City, some in deeply buried contexts.

Human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric contexts. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources, as identified in the 2040 General Plan Background Report (which provides information on the existing environmental setting), are located within close proximity to the Sacramento and American Rivers and other watercourses (City of Sacramento 2015).

The 2040 General Plan land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and impacts on sensitive prehistoric resources. High sensitivity areas may be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today. Recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the downtown area is highly sensitive for both historic- and prehistoric-period archaeological resources. Native American burials and artifacts were found in 2005 during construction of the New City Hall and historic period archaeological resources are abundant downtown due to the evolving development of the area and, in part, to the raising of the surface street level in the 1860s and 1870s, which created basements out of the first floors of many buildings.

A Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) was prepared for the project by SummitWest Environmental, Inc. (SWE; SWE 2025). The discussion of cultural resources in this section is based on that report, which is included in full as Appendix G to this Initial Study. The CRA included records searches and review of historic topographic maps and aerials, pedestrian survey, and an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Appendix G for the regulatory background and a detailed description of the methods and analysis.

Records Searches and Historic Topographic Maps and Aerials

SWE Archaeologists conducted a records search at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) on July 2, 2025. Twenty four previous investigations were identified in the records search, three of which intersect the project site. Three previously recorded historic-age (i.e., 50 years old or older) resources were identified within 0.5-mile of the project site, with the project site falling within the boundaries of the Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic District. The District consists of historic-age levees, pumping plants, roads, and canals and was found eligible for listing in the NRHP in 1994 but was reevaluated in 2019 and determined to be ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) due to loss of integrity. No precontact resources were identified within 0.5-mile of the project site. A review of the Built Environment Resources Directory did not identify any significant non-archaeological built environment resources within the project site.

On July 2, 2025, SWE requested that the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the project site. The NAHC responded on July 3, 2025, indicating that the results of the Sacred Lands File

search were positive; however, no information on the nature or location of the positive result was provided. The NAHC provided a contact list of 12 individuals representing five Native American Tribes and recommended contacting them for more information.

#### Pedestrian Survey

A pedestrian survey was conducted on July 9, 2025, by a qualified SummitWest archaeologist. Ground visibility was 90 percent due to recent disking, and the entire project site was subject to pedestrian survey with transects spaced 15 meters apart. No cultural resources were identified within the project site as a result of the survey.

#### Environmental Setting

The City and the surrounding area are known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Archaeological materials, including human burials, have been found throughout the City and human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric contexts. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources are located near the Sacramento and American rivers and other watercourses.

The 2040 General Plan land use diagram designates a wide swath of land along the American River as Parks, which limits development and impacts on sensitive prehistoric resources. High sensitivity areas may be found in other areas related to the ancient flows of the rivers, with differing meanders than found today. Recent discoveries during infill construction in downtown Sacramento have shown that the downtown area is highly sensitive for both historic- and prehistoric-period archaeological resources.

#### Standards of Significance

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

- Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- Cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- Directly or indirectly destroy or remove an archaeological resource.

#### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2040 General Plan on prehistoric and historic resources. See Chapter 4.5.

General plan policies identified as reducing such effects call for identification of resources on project sites (Policy HCR-1.1, HCR-1.17), conditions for resource discovery (HCR-A-8), early consultation with owners and land developers to minimize effects (Policy HCR-1.6) and encouragement of adaptive reuse of historic resources (Policy HCR-1.12). Demolition of historic resources is deemed a last resort. (Policy HCR-1.10)

The Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2040 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable effect on historic resources and archaeological resources. (Impacts 4.5-1, 2, 3)

#### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?
- B. Would the project cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** No previously recorded cultural resources eligible for the NRHP and CRHR are present in the project site, and no cultural resources were identified during the pedestrian survey of the project site for the proposed project. The project would not result in impacts to previously discovered historic-age or archaeological resources. However, there is the possibility that previously unknown historical resources exist below the ground surface and may be inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing construction activities.

The project site is underlain by geological formations dating to the same time period as human occupation. The geological formations are also associated with freshwater sources which are often associated with precontact occurrences. The NAHC indicated at least one Native American resource in the vicinity of the project site, and which corresponds with the proximity of an identified Nisenan village of *Momol* located near the southern banks of the American River (approximately 2 miles from the project site). However, review of historic maps and aerial imagery indicate that the site has been used as agricultural land and has been disturbed by years of tilling and disking which reduce the sensitivity of the site for buried resources. While considered relatively unlikely, ground disturbing activities during construction of the proposed project could reveal previously undiscovered resources and unauthorized removal, damage or destruction of resources could result in potentially significant impacts. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training and Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires standard measures for inadvertent discovery during construction activities. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potentially significant impact to a level of less than significant.

C. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy or remove an archaeological resource?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** No human remains are known to exist within the project site nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains which would result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 during construction activities would reduce potentially significant impacts related to the inadvertent discovery of human remains to a level of less than significant. that impact to a level of less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

##### **CUL-1: Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training Program**

The City shall require the project proponent/contractor to provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology. The WEAP shall be conducted before any project-related construction activities begin at the project site. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations.

The WEAP will also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance.

##### **CUL-2: Inadvertent Discoveries**

If cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural materials), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project's City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

1. Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources; incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a cultural resource to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.
2. Recommendations for avoidance of cultural resources will be reviewed by the City representative and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource.
3. If the discovered cultural resource can be avoided, the construction contractor(s), will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. Use of

temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American Tribes.

- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area”
4. If a cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of cultural resources:
- Each resource will be evaluated for CRHR eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria (CCR Section 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.
  - If a cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should project impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be potentially significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record.

### **CUL-3: Implement Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains**

There is always the possibility that ground disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown human remains. To avoid the potential for impacts to buried human remains, the following measures shall be implemented, as necessary, in conjunction with the construction of the project:

- Pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(e) and PRC Section 5097.98, if human bone, or bone of unknown origin, is found at any time during on- or off-site construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the Sacramento County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC, who shall identify the person believed to be the most likely descendent (MLD). The project proponent and MLD, with the assistance of the archaeologist, shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreed upon treatment shall address the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. PRC allows 48 hours for the MLD to make their wishes known to the landowner after being granted access to the site. If the MLD and the other parties do not agree on the reburial method, the project will follow PRC Section 5097.98(e) which states that “. . . the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.”
- Any findings shall be submitted by the archaeologist in a professional report submitted to the project applicant, the MLD, the Sacramento Community Development Department, and the California Historical Resources Information System, Northeast Information Center.

### **Findings**

All additional significant environmental effects of the project relating to Cultural Resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Cultural Resources beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**6. ENERGY**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project:  A) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources during project construction or operation?			X
B) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X

**Background and Setting**

Please reference the Energy Chapter of the Master EIR for a description of energy regulations and existing energy sources in the City.

**Standards of Significance**

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if any of the following would occur as a result of the project:

- Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

**Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies**

Structures built would be subject to CCR Titles 20 and 24, which reduce demand for electrical energy by implementing energy-efficient standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2040 General Plan includes goals and related policies to encourage energy-efficient technology by offering rebates and other incentives to commercial and residential developers, coordination with local utility providers and recruitment of businesses that research and promote energy conservation and efficiency.

The Master EIR discussed energy conservation and relevant 2040 General Plan policies in Section 4.6 (page 4.6-1). The discussion concluded that with implementation of the 2040 General Plan policies and energy regulation (e.g., Title 24) development allowed under the 2040 General Plan would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The Master EIR concluded that implementation of state regulation, coordination with energy providers and implementation of 2040 General Plan policies would reduce the potential impacts from construction of new energy production or transmission facilities to a less than significant level.

**Answers to Checklist Questions**

- A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Neither federal or State law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish thresholds that define when energy consumption is considered wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary. Compliance with CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. Energy demand related to the proposed project would include electricity consumed for space heating and cooling, electric facilities and lighting. Natural gas would not be used as part of the proposed project. Transportation-related energy consumption includes the use of fuels and electricity to power vehicles and commercial trucks. Energy would also be consumed by equipment and vehicles during construction and routine

maintenance activities.

### *Construction*

Construction of the proposed project would require consumption of fuel and electricity – primarily associated with daily commutes by construction workers, transport of site and building materials, and equipment use. Using standard fuel consumption estimates, construction activities would require approximately 20,825 gallons of diesel fuel (RCH 2026). Construction activities would be short-term and temporary and would not result in wasteful or inefficient use of energy. In addition, the following best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented during project construction in accordance with SMAQMD policies to reduce waste and energy consumption (SMAQMD 2021):

- Follow maintenance schedules to maintain equipment in optimal working order and rated energy efficiency, which would include, but not be limited to, regular replacement of filters, cleaning of compressor coils, burner tune-ups, lubrication of pumps and motors, proper vehicle maintenance, etc.
- Reduce on-site vehicle idling.
- In accordance with CALGreen criteria as well as state and local laws, at least 50 percent of on-site construction waste would be diverted from landfills through reuse and recycling.

### *Operation*

Project operations would result in an ongoing demand for fuel and electricity. Fuel demand would be associated with fuels dispensed annually. As described under Question B in Section III.3, Air Quality, the project would generate a total of 501,510 trips per year and 1,806,350 vehicle miles per year. Net trips under the proposed project with diverted and pass by trips removed would be 205,495 trips per year and 1,776,320 vehicle miles per year. The estimated annual vehicle fuel usage based on gross trip generation is approximately 49,980 gallons of gasoline and 16,170 gallons of diesel, and the annual vehicle fuel usage based on net trip generation is approximately 47,360 gallons of gasoline and 15,320 gallons of diesel.

While vehicle trips associated with the project would be new to the roads in the immediate project vicinity, the project would result in a relatively low number of new truck trips and VMT, especially in consideration of net vehicle trips. The project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy and impacts would be less than significant.

B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The project would comply with the current State of California building energy efficiency standards<sup>2</sup> and green building standards<sup>3</sup>. The project site is located along major transportation corridors with proximate access to the Interstate freeway system, and the proposed convenience store and fuel station would take advantage of existing infrastructure systems. The proposed project supports urban design and planning processes identified under the State of California Energy Plan, is consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation of the State of California Energy Plan. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

---

<sup>2</sup> The CEC updates the Energy Code every three years. On August 11, 2021, the CEC adopted the 2022 Energy Code. In December, it was approved by the California Building Standards Commission for inclusion into the California Building Standards Code. The 2022 Energy Code encourages efficient electric heat pumps, establishes electric-ready requirements for new homes, expands solar photovoltaic and battery storage standards, strengthens ventilation standards, and more. Buildings whose permit applications are applied for on or after January 1, 2023, must comply with the 2022 Energy Code.

<sup>3</sup> The California Green Building Standards Code—CCR Part 11, Title 24—known as CALGreen, is the first-in-the-nation mandatory green building standards code developed to meet the state's GHG reduction goals. CALGreen includes regulations for energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, environmental quality, and includes mandatory provisions for commercial, residential, and public-school buildings.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Energy beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**7. GEOLOGY, SOILS, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND PALEONTOLOGY**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project:			
A) Allow development that could result in substantial soil erosion?			X
B) Introduce either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards?			X
C) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state?			X
D) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or land use plan?			X
E) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?			X

**Background and Setting**

A geotechnical engineering investigation was prepared for this project by SALEM Engineering Group, Inc. (SALEM; SALEM 2025a) and is included as Appendix F to this Initial Study. The geotechnical report was prepared to determine the suitability of the proposed project based on the site’s geotechnical/geological characteristics and to identify appropriate mitigation requirements, if necessary. The study included reconnaissance surveys of the project site. Nine exploratory test borings were conducted within the project site on June 18 and 19, 2025 with a maximum depth of 36.5 feet. In addition, a percolation test of proposed storm drainage areas was performed. Refer to Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix F.

Seismicity

As described in the Master EIR, the City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and there are no known faults within the area. Fault rupture within the City is highly unlikely and, consequently, people or structures within the City would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, the Master EIR identifies the entire City as being subject to potential damage from earthquake ground shaking at a maximum intensity of VII on the Modified Mercalli scale. The closest potentially active faults to the project site include the Foothills Fault System, located approximately 23 miles from Sacramento; the Great Valley fault, located 26 miles from Sacramento; and the Hunting Creek- Berryessa Fault, located 38 miles from Sacramento. The Foothills Fault System is considered capable of generating an earthquake with a Richter-Scale magnitude of 6.8; the Great Valley Fault can generate an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.9; the Concord-Green Valley Fault can generate an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.9, and the Hunting Creek-Berryessa Fault can generate a 6.9 magnitude earthquake. A major earthquake on any of these faults could cause strong ground shaking in Sacramento.

Topography and Soils

The project site consists of flat terrain, with an elevation of 18 feet amsl. The soils encountered during the test borings included undocumented fill soils and native soils typical of those found in the region, generally consisting of interbedded layers of firm to hard lean clay with sand or fat clay, to around 10 feet below ground surface. The clay layers are underlain by interbedded layers of sandy silt, silt, and silty sand to the maximum depth explored of 36.5 feet below ground surface (SALEM 2025a). Soils in the project site as mapped by NRCS consist of Clear Lake clay, hardpan substratum, drained, 0 to 1 percent slopes. This soil unit is comprised of 85 percent Clear Lake and

similar soils and 15 percent minor components. The Clear Lake has a parent material of alluvium and is typical of basin floors. The typical profile is clay from 0 – 4 inches, clay loam from 34 – 48 inches and is cemented from 48 – 64 inches, with a high runoff class and is somewhat poorly drained. The minor components are Consumnes and San Joaquin forms. The Consumnes introduces a hydric soils rating but is too minor. Refer to Figure 6 in Appendix A for the distribution of soils in the project site.

#### Regional Geology

The project site is located within the Sacramento Valley portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province of California. The Great Valley is bordered to the north by the Cascade and Klamath Ranges, to the west by the Coast Ranges, to the east by the Sierra Nevada, and to the south by the Transverse Ranges. The valley was formed by tilting of the Sierra Block with the western side dropping to form the valley and eastern side uplifting to form the Sierra Nevada. The valley is characterized by a thick sequence of sediments derived from erosion of the adjacent Sierra Nevada to the east and the Coast Ranges to the west. These sedimentary rocks are mainly Cretaceous in age. These deposits typically consist of silt, sand and clay deposited by drainages similar to present-day stream and river systems.

Existing mineral extraction activities in and around Sacramento include fine (sand) and coarse (gravel) construction aggregates, synthetic graphite, as well as clay. With one exception, there are no permitted mining operations or oil production areas within the Planning Area. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and rock or soil formations that have produced fossil material. The Quaternary sediments of the Great Valley are gravels laid down by large river systems. These deposits contain well-preserved vertebrate and plant fossils similar to the flora and fauna we see today.

#### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if any of the following would occur as a result of the proposed project:

- Allow development that could result in substantial soil erosion.
- Introduce either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards.
- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state.
- Result in the loss of availability of a locally imported mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

#### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

Chapter 4.7 of the Master EIR evaluated the potential effects related to seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, erosion, existing mineral resources and paleontological resources in the City. Implementation of identified policies in the 2040 General Plan reduced all effects to a less than significant level. Policy ERC-7.2 requires regular review of the City's seismic and geologic safety standards, and Policy ERC-7.1 requires geotechnical investigations for project sites located in areas of expansive soils and high liquefaction risk to identify and respond to geologic hazards, when present.

#### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project allow development that could result in substantial soil erosion?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Ground disturbing activities during construction have the potential to result in soil erosion associated with loose, disturbed soils being eroded by high winds or stormwater runoff. The project site has been previously graded and is level. The potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is low. Furthermore, construction-related disturbance would be temporary, and the risk of erosion would be further reduced by implementation of BMPs during construction, including implementation of a SWPPP which must be prepared to obtain a grading permit from the City. The City imposes standards to minimize erosion and runoff set forth in the "Administrative and Technical Procedures Manual for Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control," and in the City's grading ordinance (Sacramento City Code Section 15.88). The proposed project would not pose a hazard associated with substantial soil erosion.

- B. Would the project introduce either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Seismic hazards can lead to ground shaking, fault rupture, and soil liquefaction which can cause buildings and infrastructure to tilt, sink, or collapse. Geologic hazards are related to soils susceptible to erosion, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, or expansive soils.

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone and there are no known faults within the area; therefore, the potential for fault rupture on the project site is low and the project would not result in risk associated with fault rupture. However, the City is within a seismically active region and earthquake-related ground shaking could be expected during the design life of structures constructed on the project site. The result could be ground shaking and liquefaction caused by major seismic events in the region.

Liquefaction is caused when loosely packed, saturated cohesionless soils experience a temporary but total loss of strength as a result of stresses associated with earthquakes. Adverse impacts associated with ground shaking and liquefaction include the risk of structure failure and injury or death. The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Standards Code (CBSC; CCR Title 24). Requirements specific to liquefaction can be mitigated through conformance to the soil and foundation support parameters and grading requirements in the CBSC. The City establishes design standards within the local amendments identified in Chapter 15.20 of Sacramento City Code. California Health and Safety Code Div. 13, Pt. 3, Section 19100-19217, Earthquake Protection, requires that buildings be designed to resist stresses produced by lateral forces caused by earthquakes. Earthquake resistant design and materials are required to meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the CBSC Seismic Risk Zone 3 improvements. Furthermore, based on the results of the geotechnical engineering investigation, the potential for liquefaction/seismic settlement to impact the site is considered low (SALEM 2025a).

Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which soils move laterally during seismic shaking and is often associated with liquefaction. The project site is in an area of the City that is topographically flat, and the likelihood of lateral spreading is low (SALEM 2025a). The entire City has not been included in California Department of California (CDC) California Geological Survey landslide maps (CDC 2025a). The project site has been previously graded and is relatively level and is surrounded by urban development. The possibility of seismically induced landslide hazards is low (SALEM 2025a).

Laboratory testing of the test borings from the project site found that the near surface soils have high compressibility characteristics, moderate collapse potential and medium expansive potential, and when compacted as an engineered fill the soils have poor pavement support characteristics (SALEM 2025a). The proposed project would be required to comply with CBSC and City building requirements and the City's 2040 General Plan and Master EIR, which require conformance with the CBSC and require project applicants to prepare site-specific geotechnical evaluations containing recommendations to address geotechnical hazards. The geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project is included as Appendix F and the project proponent would be required to comply with the recommendations contained therein, which include removal of undocumented fill and placement of imported non-expansive fill and suitable compacted engineered fill, and recommendations to support slabs and foundations. With implementation of the CBSC, City building requirements, and the recommendations from the geotechnical investigation, project-related impacts associated with geologic, seismic or soil hazards would be less than significant.

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

**No additional significant environmental effect.** As described in the Master EIR, existing mineral extraction in the City and surrounding areas includes sand and gravel construction aggregate, synthetic graphite and clay. Based on the Mineral Land Classification prepared by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is located within the Portland cement concrete-grade aggregate and kaolin clay resources production-consumption region (CDC 2025b). The project site is classified as MRZ-1, which means that the available geologic information indicates a low likelihood for the presence of significant aggregate resources (CDC 2018). The proposed project does not involve extraction of mineral resources and is consistent with the land use and development envisioned in the 2040 General Plan for the area. The proposed project would have no impact on the availability of known mineral resources.

- E. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** As described in the Master EIR, the City is characterized by a largely developed urban area that is located on the alluvial plain of the Sacramento Valley. There are no unique or unusual landforms that would be considered a unique geologic feature nor are there any known unique paleontological resources in the area. The proposed project site has been previously disced and graded, and the project area is not known to contain unique geologic features or be sensitive for paleontological resources. Paleontological resources or unique geologic features are not anticipated to occur. The proposed project would have no impact on paleontological resources.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources and Paleontology beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project: A) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X
B) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X

**Background and Setting**

An Air Quality Technical Report addressing GHGs was prepared for the project by RCH (RCH 2026). The analysis contained in this section is based on that report, which is included in full as Appendix E to this Initial Study. Refer to Appendix E for the regulatory background and a detailed description of the methods and analysis. Air quality impacts are discussed in Section III.3 of this Initial Study.

The City’s climate is characterized as Mediterranean, which is strongly influenced by the Pacific Ocean and characterized by hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters.

GHGs play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. GHGs are responsible for “trapping” solar radiation in the earth’s atmosphere, a phenomenon known as the greenhouse effect. Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed to be responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth’s climate, known as global climate change or global warming. Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable, in large part, to human activities associated with on-road and off-road transportation, industrial/manufacturing, electricity generation by utilities and consumption by end users, residential and commercial on-site fuel usage, and agriculture and forestry. Emissions of CO2 are largely byproducts of fossil fuel combustion.

The quantity of GHGs in the atmosphere responsible for climate change is not precisely known, but it is enormous. No single project alone would measurably contribute to an incremental change in the global average temperature or to global or local climates or microclimates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts relative to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

Regulatory Setting

Several regulations currently exist related to GHG emissions, predominantly AB 32, Executive Order S-3-05, and Senate Bill (SB) 32. AB 32 requires that Statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Executive Order S-3-05 established the GHG emission reduction target for the State to reduce to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020 (AB 32), 40 percent below the 1990 level by 2030, and 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050 (SB 32).

Please see Chapter 4.8 of the Master EIR for a description of State and federal regulations related to GHG emissions in the City. Local Plans and Policies are listed below:

**Sacramento Area Council of Governments MTP/SCS:** As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), SACOG has developed the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT (SACOG 2019).

**City of Sacramento Climate Action and Adaptation Plan:** The City adopted the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) in February 2024. The CAAP sets new GHG emission target for the City and community and establishes strategies and actions to achieve the City's goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. CAAP was developed to exceed the requirements of SB 32, which calls for a reduction in statewide GHG emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The CAAP also demonstrates the City's plan for substantial progress towards consistency with the State's goals for GHG emission reductions, as enacted by AB 1279 and the CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan which sets a path to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 (CARB 2022). The CAAP is a qualified GHG reduction plan per CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b) which allows streamlined GHG impact analysis for development projects in the City (City of Sacramento 2024c).

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact is considered significant if any of the following would occur as a result of the project:

- Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs.

### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR found that GHG emissions that would be generated by development consistent with the 2040 General Plan would contribute to climate change on a cumulative basis. Policies of the General Plan identified in the Master EIR that would reduce construction related GHG emissions include: LUP-11.7, Building Materials, and LUP-11.8, Construction Processes. The 2040 General Plan incorporates the GHG reduction strategy of the CAAP. The discussion of GHG emissions and climate change in the Master EIR are incorporated by reference in this Initial Study (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150).

The Master EIR identified numerous policies included in the 2040 General Plan that addressed GHG emissions and climate change, including Policy LUP-4.13, Future-Ready Gas Stations which requires at least one high-speed electric vehicle charging station per three fuel pumps at any proposed new or expanding gas stations. See Draft Master EIR, Chapter 4.8, and pages 4.8-1 et seq.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The Master EIR analyzed these issues under impact 4.8-1 and concluded that projects developed under the 2040 General Plan would comply with all regulations adopted in furtherance of CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan to the extent applicable and required by law. Other relevant GHG emissions reduction targets for the 2040 General Plan include those established by SB 32 and AB 1279, which require GHG emissions to be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, and 85 percent below 1990 levels by 2045, respectively. The 2040 General Plan and CAAP measures will enable the City to meet the 2030 GHG emission requirements included in SB 32, even with a voluntary approach to New Building Electrification.

In addition, AB 1279 requires that the state achieve net zero GHG emissions by no later than 2045 and achieve and maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter. However, since the specific path to compliance for the state in regard to the long-term goals will likely require development of technology or other changes that are not currently known or available, specific additional reduction measures in addition to the policies presented within the 2040 General Plan would be speculative and cannot be identified at this time. The 2040 General Plan would assist in meeting the City's contribution to GHG emission reduction targets in California. Implementation of the 2040 General Plan would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and was deemed to have a less than significant impact for this issue.

SMAQMD has adopted qualitative thresholds of significance for GHG emissions during operations of projects. However, SMAQMD's CEQA Guidelines note that, where local jurisdictions have adopted thresholds or guidance for analyzing GHG emissions, the local thresholds should be used for the project analysis. As discussed above, the City's CAAP is a qualified plan for the reduction of GHG pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Development projects under the City's jurisdiction would have less than significant GHG emission impacts if the

project would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction measures in CAAP. Where projects are inconsistent with the City’s CAAP, the project would be analyzed for consistency with SMAQMD’s BMPs and thresholds of significance. GHG emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project were calculated using CalEEMod 2022.1, and the results are provided for informational purposes.

*Construction*

GHG emissions generated during project construction would be associated with vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips. The project’s temporary construction GHG emissions are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions During Construction**

Condition	Annual Emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Construction Emissions	200
30-Year Amortized	7
<b>Significance Threshold</b>	<b>1,100</b>
Significant Impact?	No

Source: CARB EMFAC and OFFROAD  
CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

*Operation*

GHG emissions generated during operation of the proposed project would be associated with vehicle trips, energy use, water use/wastewater conveyance, refrigerants, and solid waste disposal.

As described under Question B in Section III.3, Air Quality, project trip generation would be reduced as a result of diverted and pass-by trips. The project would generate a total of 501,510 trips per year and 1,806,350 vehicle miles per year. Net trips under the proposed project would be 205,495 trips per year and 1,776,320 vehicle miles per year. The estimated annual vehicle fuel usage based on gross trip generation is approximately 49,980 gallons of gasoline and 16,170 gallons of diesel, and the annual vehicle fuel usage based on net trip generation is approximately 47,360 gallons of gasoline and 15,320 gallons of diesel.

Project operations would generate 820 metric tons of CO2e per year (or 788 metric tons of CO2e per year using net traffic generation), less than the significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO2e per year. Refer to Table 7.

**Table 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions During Operation**

Source	Annual Emissions (CO2e metric tons)
Mobile	609 (578)
Area	<1
Energy (Electrical)	45
Water	<1
Waste	2
Refrigeration	163
<b>Total Emissions</b>	<b>820 (788)</b>
<b>Significance Threshold</b>	<b>1,100</b>
Significant Impact? (Y/N)	No

Source: CARB CalEEMod  
CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

Note: Emissions shown in parenthesis were calculated using net vehicle trips

As previously mentioned, development projects would have less than significant GHG emission impacts if the project would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction measures in CAAP. A project is consistent with CAAP if population and employment growth resulting from the project would be accounted for in the growth projections used to develop the plan and if the project would be consistent with the plan’s applicable GHG reduction measures. The proposed project would not result in population growth in the City. Operation of the convenience store and fuel station under the proposed project would require approximately 12 employees who would likely be hired from the local employment pool. Should individuals relocate to the City to work at the proposed project, the increase in population would be minimal. Furthermore, the proposed project is consistent with the land use designation for the project site. Any increase in population as a result of the proposed project would have been accounted for in the 2040 General Plan and CAAP.

Consistency with CAAP's GHG reduction measures is presented in the following table.

**Table 8. Project Consistency with City of Sacramento Climate Action and Adaptation Plan**

<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Measure</b>	<b>Project Consistency</b>
<b>Built Environment</b>	
E1 Support Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) as it implements the 2030 Zero Carbon Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This measure is implemented by SMUD and the City.
E2 Eliminate natural gas in new construction.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project does not include the use of natural gas.
E3 Transition natural gas in existing buildings to carbon-free electricity by 2045.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The project does not include existing buildings.
E4 Increase the amount of electricity produced from local resources and work with SMUD to install additional local storage by 2030.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This measure is primarily implemented by SMUD, and the project will rely on electricity services provided by SMUD.
E5 Support infill growth with the goal that 90 percent of growth is in the established and center/corridor communities and 90 percent small-lot and attached homes by 2040, consistent with the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project is located within the Fruitridge/Broadway Community Plan area, in southeast Sacramento. The project would be considered infill and would develop a vacant parcel surrounded by urban development. Due to the project's proximity to regional transportation corridors and residential development, the project is expected to result in a net reduction of vehicle miles traveled.
<b>Mobility</b>	
TR-1 Improve active transportation infrastructure to achieve 6 percent active transportation mode share by 2030 and 12 percent by 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project would support this measure by improving existing sidewalks along the project site frontage, which would be largely set back from the roadway with a landscaped parkway. The project would incorporate bicycle parking into its design.
TR-2 Support public transit improvements to achieve 11 percent public transit mode share by 2030 and maintain through 2045.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This measure is implemented by the Sacramento Regional Transit District and the City.
TR-3 Achieve zero-emission vehicle adoption rates of 28 percent for passenger vehicles and 22 percent for commercial vehicles by 2030 and 100 percent for all vehicles by 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project would support this measure by complying with all applicable City codes and CALGreen requirements for private development electric vehicle charging infrastructure.
<b>Waste</b>	
W-1 Work to reduce organic waste disposal by 75 percent below 2014 levels by 2025.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project would support this measure by complying with all applicable City and State regulations to divert organic waste, including landscape maintenance vegetation waste.

*Continued on next page...*

**Table 8 (continued)**

<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Measure</b>	<b>Project Consistency</b>
<b><i>Water and Wastewater</i></b>	
WW-1 Reduce water utility emissions (in metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e per MG) by 100 percent by 2030 and maintain that through 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project would support this measure by complying with all applicable City and CALGreen requirements for low-flow plumbing fixtures and water efficient landscaping.
WW-2 Reduce wastewater emissions by 22 percent by 2030 and 40 percent by 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> The project would support this measure by complying with City and CALGreen indoor water use efficiency requirements and by installing drainage swales in landscaped areas of the project site to reduce stormwater runoff.
<b><i>Carbon Sequestration</i></b>	
CS-1 Increase urban tree canopy cover to 25 percent by 2030 and 35 percent by 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> There are no existing trees on the project site. The project's proposed landscaping includes trees providing 5,772 square feet of shade (e.g., canopy cover). Refer to the Preliminary Landscape Plan in Appendix D.

Note: Green shading indicates the project is not consistent with the greenhouse gas emissions reduction measure,

The proposed project would be consistent with CAAP GHG reduction measures; therefore, analysis for consistency with SMAQMD's BMPs and thresholds of significance is not required.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in GHG emissions exceeding SMAQMD's best management practice thresholds and the project would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction measures in CAAP. The proposed project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

- B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the Statewide level; as such, compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the project would not conflict with those plans and regulations. The City has integrated a CAAP into the 2040 General Plan. Potential impacts related to climate change from development within the City are assessed based on the project's compliance with the City's newly adopted CAAP reduction measures. The majority of the reduction measures set forth in CAAP are citywide efforts in support of reducing overall citywide emissions of GHG and are not applicable to individual development projects. As described under Question A, above, the project would be consistent with CAAP.

CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan extends and expands upon earlier scoping plans with a target of reducing anthropogenic GHG emissions to 85 percent below 1990 levels by 2045. The 2022 Scoping Plan's strategies that are applicable to the project include reducing fossil fuel use, energy demand, and VMT. The actions and outcomes in the plan will achieve significant reductions in fossil fuel combustion by deploying clean technologies and fuels, further reductions in short-lived climate pollutants, support for sustainable development, increased action on natural and working lands to reduce emissions and sequester carbon, and the capture and storage of carbon.

The proposed project would be consistent with these strategies through the project's location and design, which includes complying with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Efficiency Energy Standards and installing energy-efficient LED lighting, water-efficient faucets and toilets, water efficient landscaping and irrigation, and electric vehicle infrastructure. These standards are intended to encourage more sustainable and environmentally friendly building practices, including the conservation of natural resources and the use of energy-efficient materials and equipment. The project would be served by SMUD, which is required to increase its renewable energy procurement in accordance with SB 100 targets.

The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**9. HAZARDS AND PUBLIC SAFETY**

<b>Issues:</b>	<b>Effect will be studied in the EIR</b>	<b>Effect can be mitigated to less than significant</b>	<b>No additional significant environmental effect</b>
Would the project: A) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?			X
B) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?			X
C) Expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?			X

**Background and Setting**

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has primary regulatory responsibility over hazardous materials in California, working in conjunction with the USEPA to enforce and implement hazardous materials laws and regulations. As required by Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code, DTSC maintains a hazardous waste and substances site list for the State, known as the Cortese List. Regional Water Quality Control Boards are the agencies responsible for identifying, monitoring, and cleaning up underground storage tanks.

The DTSC's Enforcement and Emergency Response Division administers the technical implementation of environmental programs at the local level via the State's Unified Program. The City falls under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, designated as the lead Certified Unified Program Agency, for management and issuance of permits for all hazardous materials. The California Health and Safety Code (CCR Title 19 Section 5030.2) requires preparation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) for businesses that handle hazardous materials in quantities equal to or greater than 55 gallons of a liquid, 500 pounds of a solid, 200 cubic feet of compressed gas, or extremely hazardous substances above the threshold planning quantity (CCR Title 19 Chapter 2, California Accidental Release Prevention, Table 1). The transport of hazardous materials is also subject to United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) regulations for the movement of hazardous materials originating in and traveling through the State, primarily enforced by the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans.

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by SMAQMD apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with these regulations respecting asbestos may result in a notice of violation being issued by the SMAQMD and civil penalties under state and/or federal law, in addition to possible action by the USEPA under federal law. Federal law covers several different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Section 61.145).

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project by SALEM (SALEM 2025b). The ESA consisted of a site reconnaissance, ESA user and owner questionnaires, reviewing historic records, City directories, and federal, State, and local regulatory agency file information listings using the Environmental Data Resources database, DTSC's Envirostor database, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board's GeoTracker. Refer to Appendix I for the ESA cover letter describing the findings.

The project site is currently undeveloped but has a history of agricultural land uses since 1937. SALEM's review of historical aerial photographs and regulatory agency records indicate that a retail gasoline station occupied part of the project site and the adjacent parcel to the northwest from 1972 through late 2007 or early 2008. The gasoline

station was the source of an unauthorized release of gasoline (i.e., Leaking Underground Storage Tank; LUST) discovered on May 14, 1998 which impacted soil, soil vapor, and groundwater beneath the facility. The site was remediated under the regulatory agency supervision of the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, and a “case closed” designation was issued on January 17, 2012 (SALEM 2025b). A site remediation monitoring system was visible in the project site in photographs from 2010 but no longer visible in photographs dated 2014.

The SMAQMD records indicated that SMAQMD issued a notice of violation to the site dated September 12, 2003, for an undisclosed reason and which was resolved; permits for a catalytic oxidizer and soil vapor extraction in December 2006; and permits for demolition of asbestos-containing structures in September 2007.

SALEM conducted a site reconnaissance on June 5, 2025. During the reconnaissance, the project site was vacant land. No hazardous materials, discolored soils or evidence of underground storage tanks were observed during the site visit. Gravel was observed in the western area of the project site, indicative of a former materials stockpile or excavation. A pad-mounted electrical transformer was observed in the north-central portion of the project site and appeared to be uninstalled and inoperative. No other indications of former structures were observed.

The database review conducted for the ESA indicated there are numerous mapped sites within one mile of the project site. The project site was listed for the previously mentioned unauthorized release of gasoline discovered in 1998, which was remediated and designated “case closed” in 2012. A nearby unauthorized release of pesticides was reported from 2009 approximately 0.13 mile northwest of the project site, near the I-80 and Northgate Boulevard interchange. The impacted media was remediated under the regulatory authority of the RWQCB and a “no further action” designation was issued on March 1, 2012. The site is deemed to have a low potential to environmentally impact the project site and does not present a recognized environmental condition to the project site. An orphan site was identified in the database review within one mile of the project site, but due to various factors, it is deemed to have a low potential to environmentally impact the project site (SALEM 2025b). Orphan sites are contaminated sites where there is no responsible party, specifically targeting site contaminated by LUSTs.

### Standards of Significance

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

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

### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 4.9. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities, and exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during the life of the 2040 General Plan. Impacts identified related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant. Policies included in the 2035 General Plan, including EJ-1.5 (Compatibility with Hazardous Materials Facilities), EJ-1.7 (Transportation Routes), and EJ-1.8 (Investigation of Sites for Contamination) were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Based on the ESA conducted for the project, the project site has a history of a recognized environmental condition and there are two nearby historic recognized environmental conditions. The on-site condition consisted of a LUST resulting in unauthorized release of gasoline which was remediated under the regulatory oversight of the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, and a “case closed” designation was issued on January 17, 2012 (SALEM 2025b). The methods of remediation included groundwater extraction, soil vapor extraction, oxygen diffusion and excavation and removal of impacted soil. A reported 3,071 tons of impacted soil and 10,558,405 gallons of impacted groundwater were removed from the project site. A vapor intrusion investigation conducted in August 2007 concluded that site conditions did not present

a vapor intrusion risk to indoor air on the project site. Asbestos containing structures were removed from the project site pursuant to a permit issued by the SMAQMD in September 2007. No other recognized environmental conditions were identified associated with the project site.

Two historic recognized environmental conditions were reported within one mile of the project site – the previously mentioned unauthorized release of pesticides was reported from 2009 approximately 0.13 mile northwest of the project site, and an orphan site approximately 1 mile from the project site. The pesticide release was remediated under the regulatory authority of the RWQCB and a “no further action” designation was issued on March 1, 2012. Both sites are deemed to have a low potential to environmentally impact the project site (SALEM 2025b). There are no other reported hazardous materials present on the project site and based on SALEM’s field observations and input from regulatory agencies, the potential for adverse environmental impacts to the subject property associated with the current use of the site and uses of the adjoining properties appear to be low.

While there are no current contaminated soils associated with the project site and the likelihood of exposure from contaminated soils is considered to be low, construction activities would involve grading, excavation, and other ground disturbing activities which could expose previously unknown contaminants. As described in the Master EIR, in the event that previously unidentified contaminated soils or other hazardous materials are discovered during construction activities, the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department would be notified and would assume regulatory oversight of characterization of the materials. Upon confirmation of contamination, a remediation plan prepared pursuant to Section 25401.05(a)(1) of the California Health and Safety Code and approved by the appropriate oversight agency or authority must be implemented at the site. Adherence to these existing regulatory requirements and 2040 General Plan Policy EJ 1.8 would ensure that potential exposure of people to existing contaminated soils from buildout of the 2040 General Plan would be less than significant. The project would not result in any additional or more significant environmental effects.

- B. Would the project expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** Potential exposure of people to hazardous building materials (e.g., asbestos and lead-based paint) or other hazardous materials could occur because of existing hazardous materials in the project site, or through upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment as a result of the proposed project. Potential risks to people associated with nearby airports is also discussed.

#### *Hazardous Building Materials and Other Hazardous Materials*

The Master EIR determined that buildout of the 2040 General Plan could necessitate demolition of existing structures which could potentially result in the exposure of construction workers or other sensitive receptors to hazardous substances such as asbestos or lead-based paints. The ESA prepared for the project included an evaluation of asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint and other hazardous materials for the potential to occur or result in exposure associated with the proposed project.

The project site has been vacant since at least 2008, and the project site is not associated with existing hazardous material uses or spills. Prior uses of the site include agriculture and a gas station (from 1972 through late 2007 or early 2008). As described in the ESA, concentrations of environmentally persistent pesticides requiring regulatory action for similar properties is typically low. The site was remediated and designated “case closed” in 2012 for a LUST associated with the former gas station, and the SMAQMD issued a permit to demolish asbestos-containing structures in September 2007. Based on the ESA, the site does not contain existing recognized environmental conditions. The project does not require demolition of existing structures; therefore, exposure of people to asbestos is also considered to be low. No remaining wells or septic tanks associated with the prior development were documented or observed in the project site but could be discovered during construction if present. In general, the likelihood of contamination on the site based on existing and prior uses and from adjoining properties is considered low. As previously described, unanticipated exposure of previously unknown potential contaminants during construction was evaluated in the 2040 General Plan and compliance with local, State and federal regulations and procedures would be required.

Potentially hazardous materials would be used during construction and operation of the proposed project. If hazardous materials are spilled or released during routine transport, use, or disposal, these substances could pose a risk to the environment and to human health. The route transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, State and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure, including the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, DTSC, USEPA, and the USDOT. No extremely hazardous substances at threshold quantities are anticipated for the proposed project (CCR Title 19 Chapter 2, California Accidental Release

Prevention, Table 1). As described in the Master EIR, the County has developed an Area Plan for Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents and the City's Fire Department has a hazardous materials response team and works in cooperation with other regional and State agencies in the event of a major emergency.

The potentially hazardous materials used during construction of the proposed project would include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, welding and soldering supplies, etc. Any hazardous materials stored on-site would be within a secure area with fuels stored in a locked container (above ground storage tank).

Hazardous materials used during operation of the convenience store and fuel station were evaluated. During operation, the project would require routine transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials, including fuels for fuel station operations and small amounts of hazardous materials associated with landscaping and facility maintenance (e.g., pesticides, fertilizers, paints, and other household hazardous products). The project includes eight vehicle fueling positions which would be supplied by two underground storage tanks (two 20,000 gallon tanks). Fuel pump dispensers would be required to be equipped with automatic shutoffs and other safety devices and signage per applicable codes and regulations. Underground storage tanks would be subject to regulations dictating safety design, equipment and signage to protect public health and safety from leaks, fire, or spills, including spill containment and overfill prevention.

An HMBP would be required for the proposed project during construction and/or operation for hazardous materials exceeding 55 gallons or other thresholds defined in the California Health and Safety Code. The HMBP would be submitted electronically via the California Environmental Reporting System and would include an inventory of all hazardous materials, Material Safety Data Sheets for each hazardous substance, and an outline of the emergency response plan and procedures in the event of a significant or threat of a significant release of hazardous material. The transport of large quantities of hazardous materials, such as fuel deliveries, would be subject to USDOT regulations, enforced by California Highway Patrol and Caltrans.

All hazardous materials used during construction and operation of the project would be handled in compliance with applicable local, State and federal requirements. Impacts associated with hazardous building materials and other hazardous materials would be less than significant.

#### *Safety Hazards Associated with Airports*

The airports nearest to the project site are Rio Linda Airport and Sacramento McClellan Airport, 3.25 miles and 4.2 miles northeast of the project site, respectively. The project site is not located within the influence areas of the airports (SACOG 2025). The project would not expose people to safety hazards or excessive noise associated with an airport. No impact would occur.

- C. Would the project expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The geotechnical engineering investigation prepared for the project included a review of groundwater (SALEM 2025a). Groundwater was encountered at depths of 21 to 23 feet below ground surface during the subsurface investigation. Based on review of available groundwater depth records with the California Department of Water Resources, the nearest recorded well approximately 0.75 mile southwest of the project site recorded a historical high groundwater depth of 12.8 feet below the ground surface in April 2017 (SALEM 2025a). The proposed project includes construction activities including excavation for underground utilities, foundations, and underground storage tanks exceeding depths of up to 11 feet below ground surface. While the site has a historic recognized environmental condition that included groundwater contamination, the impacted groundwater was remediated, with groundwater monitoring conducted until 2012 when the site was designated "case closed." As described in the ESA, the project site is not associated with existing groundwater contamination and nearby known sites of environmental conditions would not impact the project site due to distance or gradient (which would prevent contaminated groundwater from moving toward the project site). Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential to expose construction workers and pedestrians to contaminated groundwater.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Hazards and Public Safety beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**10. HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND FLOODING**

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

**Background and Setting**

The project site is in an urban, developed area of the City, approximately 3.1 miles northeast of the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers. The Natomas East Main Drainage Canal, also known as Steelhead Creek, is a tributary of the Sacramento River north of its confluence with the American River. The creek generally flows north to south approximately 0.25 mile east of the project site.

The City's Grading Ordinance requires that development projects comply with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP). The SQIP outlines the priorities, key elements, strategies, and evaluation methods of the City's Stormwater Management Program. The program is based on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Discharge Permit (MS4 Permit) and includes pollution reduction activities for construction sites, industrial sites, illegal discharges and illicit connections, new development, and municipal operations. In addition, before the onset of any construction activities, where the disturbed area is one acre or more in size, projects are required to obtain coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit and include erosion and sediment control plans. BMPs may consist of a wide variety of measures taken to reduce pollutants in stormwater and other non-point source runoff. Measures that reduce or eliminate post-construction-related water quality problems range from source controls, such as reduced surface disturbance, to treatment of polluted runoff, such as detention or retention basins.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps that delineate flood hazard zones for communities. The project site is on FEMA panel 06067C0063J, effective 6/16/2015 (FEMA 2025). The project area is classified as Zone A99, which is defined as an area within a 100-year flood zone with a 1 percent annual risk of inundation, but which is planned for protection by a Federal flood protection system under construction. No base flood elevations have been determined.

Section 13.08.145 of the Sacramento City Code (Mitigation of drainage impacts; design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities) requires that when a property would contribute drainage to the storm drain system or combined sewer system, all stormwater and surface runoff drainage impacts resulting from the improvement or development must be fully mitigated to ensure that the improvement or development does not affect the function of the storm drain system or combined sewer system, and that an increase in flooding or in water surface elevation that adversely affects individuals, streets, structures, infrastructure, or property does not occur.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to hydrology and water quality may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the proposed project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the 2040 General Plan Master EIR:

- Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan.
- Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

Chapter 4.10 of the Master EIR evaluates the potential effects of the 2040 General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities (Impacts ERC-1.4, 5.2), and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts ERC-6.6, 6.7, and 6.9). Policies included in the 2040 General Plan, including directives for regional cooperation, comprehensive flood management, and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development were identified that the Master EIR concluded would reduce all impacts to a less than significant level.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the project?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The project's potential effects on water quality as a result of project construction and operations are evaluated in the following paragraphs.

### *Construction*

The project site totals approximately 1.4 acres with only minimal potential additional off-site disturbance associated with utility connections and a sidewalk connection to the sidewalk along Northgate Boulevard. During construction, the entire project site, except where existing sidewalks transect into the project site, would be cleared and graded. Excavation for underground utilities, foundations, and underground storage tanks would occur.

Soils exposed during construction would be subject to wind, rainfall and stormwater runoff which would create the potential to degrade water quality from increased sedimentation and increased discharge (increased flow and volume of runoff). The SWRCB adopted a statewide NPDES Construction General Permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2022-0057-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The proposed project would include ground disturbance exceeding one acre; and, thus, would be subject to the foregoing regulations.

The City's SQIP contains a Construction Element that guides implementation of the NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. This General Construction Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will contain a site map(s) which shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, stormwater collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project. The SWPPP must list BMP the discharger will use to protect stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMP. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program; a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutant to be implemented if there is a failure of BMP; and a sediment monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for sediment.

Section A of the Construction General Permit describes the elements that must be contained in a SWPPP. Compliance with City requirements to protect stormwater inlets would require the developer to implement BMPs such as the use of straw bales, sandbags, gravel traps, and filters; erosion control measures such as vegetation and physical stabilization; and sediment control measures such as fences, dams, barriers, berms, traps, and basins. City staff inspects and enforces the erosion, sediment, and pollution control requirements in accordance with Sacramento City Code Section 15.88 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. In addition, the City

currently requires erosion and sediment control plans to include a requirement for a Spill Prevention and Control Plan to minimize the potential for, and effects from, spills of hazardous toxic, or petroleum substances that are typically used during construction activities.

Conformance with City regulations and permit requirements along with implementation of BMPs would ensure that construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to water quality.

### *Operations*

Impacts to water quality and waste discharge during operations could occur due to an increase in impervious surfaces which allow an increase in pollutants that could enter stormwater runoff. The project would result in approximately 0.9 acre (39,939 square feet) of impervious surfaces (4,761 square feet of building + 35,178 square feet of paved area = 39,939 square feet of impervious surfaces). Runoff from onsite impervious surfaces could result in oil, grease, sediment, pesticides and chemical residues entering waterways. The project design incorporates flow controls in the paved areas of the project site, including v-gutters to collect runoff from the driveways, fueling station canopies, and surrounding areas. Drainage from under the fuel canopies would be directed to sewer inlets with sand and oil separators. The drainage design would consist of onsite drainage swales and storm drain inlets.

As a standard condition of approval for development projects in the City, the City's Department of Utilities requires preparation and submittal of project-specific drainage studies. With submittal of the required drainage study, the Department of Utilities would review the Improvement Plans for the proposed project prior to approval to ensure that adequate water quality control facilities are incorporated. It should be noted that the proposed project would comply with Sacramento City Code Section 13.08.145, Mitigation of drainage impacts; design and procedures manual for water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water quality facilities, which requires the following:

When a property that contributes drainage to the storm drain system or combined sewer system is improved or developed, all stormwater and surface runoff drainage impacts resulting from the improvement or development shall be fully mitigated to ensure that the improvement or development does not affect the function of the storm drain system or combined sewer system, and that there is no increase in flooding or in water surface elevation that adversely affects individuals, streets, structures, infrastructure, or property.

Development projects in the City are required to adhere to NPDES MS4 Permit and SQIP requirements and the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership 2018) which include requirements associated with site design, low impact development and source control to mitigate impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. According to City Council Resolution #92-439, all groundwater discharges to the Combined or Separated Sewer and/or drainage systems are required to be regulated and monitored by City's Department of Utilities.

Conformance with the City's NPDES MS4 Permit, SQIP, Stormwater Quality Design Manual, and all other applicable regulations would ensure that operation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to water quality.

- B. Would the project substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** A floodplain is an area that is inundated during a flood event and is often physically discernable as a broad, flat area created by historical floods. According to FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is located within Zone A99 which is area planned for protection from the 100-year flood hazard by a Federal flood protection system under construction. The project site is located within the Natomas Levee Project which is underway to construct ongoing levee improvements to protect the Natomas Basin from flooding (USACE 2025). Levee improvements along the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal west levee (Reach H, approximately 0.25 mile east of the project site) were completed in 2024, and pumping station improvements underway (USACE 2025). These levee improvements will protect the project site from 100-year flood zone hazards. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Hydrology, Water Quality and Flooding beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**11. NOISE AND VIBRATION**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project: A) Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City of Sacramento General Plan or noise ordinance?		X	
B) Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X
C) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public use airport or private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise?			X

**Background and Setting**

An Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment was prepared for this project by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. (BAC 2026). The discussion of noise-related impacts in this section is based on that report, which is included as Appendix J to this Initial Study.

Noise Environment and Sensitive Receptors

Noise is defined as “unwanted sound.” The existing ambient noise environment in the project vicinity is defined by several different sources, including I-80 traffic, local traffic on Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court, and existing highway-serving commercial land uses including fast food restaurants and gas stations. The airports nearest to the project site are Rio Linda Airport and Sacramento McClellan Airport, 3.25 miles and 4.2 miles northeast of the project site, respectively. The project site is not located within the influence areas of the airports (SACOG 2025), and the airports are not a significant source of noise for the project site.

Noise-sensitive land uses are those that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors (receivers) are individual locations representing noise-sensitive land uses that may be negatively affected by noise. CEQA evaluates the project impacts based on the environmental baseline, or the physical environment conditions at the time the analysis commences. The project is within an area designated for highway serving commercial development, which is not considered a noise sensitive area; however, it is near residential and agricultural land uses for which the City has established maximum allowable noise levels. Properties west, northwest and south of the project site feature agricultural and vacant lands, but with no existing noise-sensitive receptor. Residential neighborhoods are located west of the undeveloped parcels, approximately 0.4 mile west of the project site. Two hotels are located east of Northgate Boulevard, with the nearest only 350 feet east of the project site, but the properties between the hotels and the project site are developed with various highway serving commercial uses including fast food restaurants and a gas station. Both the residential neighborhood and the hotels are subject to noise generated in their immediate vicinity and are not considered noise-sensitive receptors for the proposed project. Single-family residences south of the project site, with no existing buildings or other structures between the project site and residences could be affected by noise from the proposed project. The noise-sensitive receptor for the project was established at the property boundary of the closest residence south of the project site, approximately 470 feet south of the centerline of Rosin Court, and approximately 500 feet south of the nearest project site boundary.

Vibration and Sensitive Receptors

Groundborne vibration consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves transmitted through the ground with an average motion of zero. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena and anthropogenic causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous (e.g., factory machinery) or transient (e.g., explosions). Vibration is commonly measured in terms of velocity per second peak particle velocity, or root-mean-square (VdB) and is used to quantify vibration amplitude. Standards pertaining to perception as well as damage to structures have been developed for vibration in peak particle velocity and VdB. For the purposes of this analysis, VdB descriptor relative to one micro-inch per second is used to evaluate construction-generated vibration for building damage and human complaints. Generally, vibration levels less than 65 VdB are not perceptible to humans (BAC 2026).

Vibration-sensitive land uses are those with human occupancy in proximity to the proposed project. The closest existing commercial structure to the project site is the KFC restaurant approximately 60 feet northwest of the project site and the closest residential structure is a single-family residence approximately 550 feet south of the project site.

Regulatory Framework

The regulatory background is summarized in the following paragraphs. Refer to Appendix J for the detailed regulatory background, including the applicable thresholds and methods.

**Noise**

The 2040 General Plan includes goals, objectives and policies to prevent exposure of noise-sensitive receptors to excessive noise based on planning and adoption of regulations. Policy ERC-10-1 establishes exterior noise standards and requires mitigation for all development where the projected exterior noise levels exceed the established exterior noise standards to the extent feasible. Table 9 presents the exterior noise standards established in the City’s 2040 General Plan.

**Table 9. Exterior Noise Compatibility Standards for Various Land Uses**

Land Use Type	Highest Level of Noise Exposure that is Regarded as “Normally Acceptable” <sup>a</sup> (Ldn <sup>b</sup> or CNEL <sup>c</sup> )
Residential – Low-Density Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes <sup>d</sup>	60 dBA <sup>e, f</sup>
Residential – Multi-Family <sup>g</sup>	65 dBA
Urban Residential Infill <sup>h</sup> and Mixed-Use Projects <sup>i, j</sup>	70 dBA
Transient Lodging – Motels, Hotels	65 dBA
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	70 dBA
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheatres	Mitigation based on site-specific study
Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports	Mitigation based on site-specific study
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70 dBA
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	75 dBA
Office Buildings – Business, Commercial, and Professional	70 dBA
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	75 dBA

Source: City of Sacramento 2040 General Plan Table ERC-1, adopted from Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines 2003, October 2003.

- a. As defined in the California Office of Planning and Research Guidelines, “Normally Acceptable” means that the “specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any building involved is of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.
- b. Ldn or day-night average sound level, is an average 24-hour noise measurement that factors in day and night noise levels.
- c. CNEL, or Community Noise Equivalent Level, is a weighted average measurement of sound levels gathered throughout a 24-hour period.
- d. Applies to the primary open space area of a detached single-family home, duplex, or mobile home, which is typically the backyard or fenced side yard, as measured from the center of the primary open space area (not the property line). This standard does not apply to secondary open space areas, such as front yards, balconies, stoops, and porches.
- e. dBA, or A-weighted decibel scale, is a measurement of noise levels.
- f. The exterior noise standard for the residential area west of McClellan Airport known as McClellan Heights/Parker Homes is 65 dBA.
- g. Applies to the primary open space areas of townhomes and multi-family apartments or condominiums (private rear yards

for townhomes; common courtyards, roof gardens, or gathering spaces for multi-family developments). These standards shall not apply to balconies or small attached patios in multi-storied multi-family structures.

- h. Applies to the Central City and areas with a Residential Mixed-Use designation.
- i. All mixed-use projects located anywhere in the City of Sacramento.
- j. See notes d and g above for definition of primary open space areas for single-family and multi-family developments.

The City of Sacramento Municipal Code Chapter 8.68 addresses noise control in the City. Section 8.68.060 establishes exterior noise standards which are applicable to agricultural and residential properties:

- From 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. the exterior noise standard shall be 55 dBA.
- From 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. the exterior noise standard shall be 50 dBA.

The Code specifies the duration noise levels may exceed the established noise levels based on 5 dBA increments (e.g., the greater the noise level exceedance, the shorter time the exceedance may occur). If the ambient noise level exceeds 20 dBA above the established noise standard, noise levels may not exceed the ambient noise level.

Per City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.080, exemptions to the noise standards include noise sources due to the erection (including excavation), demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure between the hours of seven a.m. and six p.m., on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and between nine a.m. and six p.m. on Sunday; provided, however, that the operation of an internal combustion engine shall not be exempt pursuant to this subsection if such engine is not equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers which are in good working order. The City's Building Division's building inspections unit may permit work to be done during the hours that are not exempt by this subsection in the case of urgent necessity and in the interest of public health and welfare for a period not to exceed three days. Application for this exemption may be made in conjunction with the application for the work permit or during progress of the work.

City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.200 identifies specific unlawful noises, including pile drivers, hammers, tools, and other appliances and prohibits their operation between the hours of ten p.m. and seven a.m.

The City does not have a policy for assessing noise impacts associated with increases in ambient noise levels from project-generated off-site traffic. Therefore, federal noise criteria were applied. The Federal Interagency Commission on Noise developed a graduated scale based on the ambient noise levels without the project. The thresholds of impact are increases ranging from 1.5 dB to 5 dB, with the 5 dB threshold applying to ambient noise levels less than 60 dB without the project.

### **Vibration**

The 2040 General Plan Policy ERC-15 requires construction projects to comply with Federal Transit Administration vibration thresholds for assessing damage to structures. The FTA criteria applicable to damage and annoyance from vibration were used for the project.

The FTA criteria for assessing vibration damage to structures are categorized from I - IV with Category I being the least susceptible and Category IV being the most susceptible to vibration damage. FTA assigns vibration levels ranging from 90 VdB for Category IV buildings to 102 VdB for Category I buildings as the thresholds of potential damage to structures. The proposed project was evaluated for potential damage from vibration in accordance with Category II, Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster), with a threshold of 98 VdB.

The FTA criteria for assessing general vibration impacts on vibration sensitive land uses are categorized from 1 – 3 with Category 1 being the most sensitive to groundborne vibrations and Category 3 being the least sensitive. Refer to Table 10 for the land use categories and the associated impact levels for each category. The proposed project was evaluated for potential impacts to Category 2, Residences and buildings where people normally sleep, at the nearest residence south of the project site, and to Category 3, Institutional land uses with primarily daytime uses, at the KFC restaurant north of the project site.

**Table 10. Criteria for Assessing General Vibration Impacts for Various Land Uses**

Land Use Type	Impact Level (VdB) Frequent Events <sup>a</sup>	Impact Level (VdB) Occasional Events <sup>b</sup>	Impact Level (VdB) Infrequent Events <sup>c</sup>
1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior ops	65	65	65
2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep	72	75	80
3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime uses	75	78	83

Source: 2018 FTA Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment

- a. Frequent Events is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.
- b. Occasional Events is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.
- c. Infrequent Events is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day.

### Standards of Significance

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

- Generate a substantial, temporary, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance;
- Generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels;
- Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels if the project is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR evaluated the potential for development under the 2040 General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, aircraft, railways, light rail and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior (Policy ERC 10.1) interior (Policy ERC 10.3) noise standards. A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy ERC 10.1, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land uses. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior noise levels and interior noise levels (Impact ERRC 10.3), and vibration impacts (Impact ERC 10.7) were found to be significant and unavoidable.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City of Sacramento General Plan or noise ordinance?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** The noise analysis conducted for the proposed project evaluated noise levels generated during construction and operation of the project at the nearest sensitive receptor. The City has established exterior noise levels for residential and agricultural properties pursuant to City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.60. As previously mentioned, active agricultural land within the Agricultural, A, zoning designation is approximately 200 feet west of the project site; however, there are no existing sensitive receptors to evaluate. The nearest residential properties are approximately 500 feet south of the project site; therefore, the nearest sensitive receptor was at the property boundary. The effect of noise on nearby receptors largely depends on the activities being performed, the noise levels generated by those activities, the distances to the noise-sensitive receptors, relativity of noise attenuating features such as topography and existing structures, and existing ambient noise levels.

### Noise Terminology and Metrics

The noise levels are expressed in terms of dB, with A-weighting (dBA) to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time-averaged noise levels are expressed by the symbol Leq and represent a period of one hour unless otherwise specified. The Leq is the foundation of the day-night average noise level (Ldn) and shows very good correlation with community response to noise. The Ldn is a 24-hour weighted average with a 10 dB increase applied to noise levels during the evening hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Ambient Noise Levels and Significance Thresholds

Long-term (72-hour) noise readings were taken at the project site August 1 to 3, 2025 to quantify the existing ambient noise environment in the project vicinity and are presented in the following table. The readings were taken at the property boundary of the single-family residences south of the project site.

**Table 11. Long-Term (72-Hour) Noise Monitoring Results at the Nearest Sensitive Receptor**

Date	Ldn (dB)	Daytime L50 (dB)	Daytime Lmax (dB)	Nighttime L50 (dB)	Nighttime Lmax (dB)
Friday, Aug 1	58	49	69	47	69
Saturday, Aug 2	57	48	69	46	67
Sunday, Aug 3	57	48	70	46	66
Average	57.3	48.3	69.3	46.3	67.3

Source: BAC 2026

dB = decibel; Ldn = day-night average noise level; Leq = equivalent continuous sound level (L50 = continuous sound level for 30 minutes)

Notes: The nearest sensitive receptor is south of the project site, adjacent to the single-family residences property boundary. Daytime hours are defined as 7:00 am to 10:pm and nighttime hours are defined as 10:00pm to 7:00am. The results presented are the lowest measured noise levels for daytime and nighttime at each location.

The ambient readings established the existing ambient noise environment for the area. The readings found that the existing levels fall within the City’s noise standards for residential and agricultural properties which is 55 dBA during daytime and 50 dBA during nighttime (City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.060). Because the daytime and nighttime noise levels were within the City’s noise standards, no adjustments were made to the thresholds at the sensitive receptors. As such, the applied noise thresholds at the sensitive receptor were: 55 dBA L50 and 75 dBA Lmax during daytime and 50 dBA L50 and 70 dBA Lmax during nighttime.

The threshold of perception of the human ear is approximately 3 to 5 dB – a 5 dB change in noise levels is clearly noticeable to most people. For the purposes of this analysis, a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels was considered to occur where on-site operations of the proposed project would result in an increase by 5 dB or more over existing ambient noise levels.

Construction Noise

Project construction would result in noise-generating activities which would increase ambient noise levels for the duration of construction. Construction noise levels would fluctuate depending on the type of activities being performed, and the types and numbers of equipment used, how it is operated, and how well it is maintained. Construction equipment would be used sporadically throughout the project site but would be concentrated primarily in areas requiring substantial improvements (such as excavation for the underground fuel storage tanks and the building foundations). Multiple pieces of construction equipment would rarely be used simultaneously near each other.

Project construction is anticipated to take approximately 12 months to complete and would be temporary. The noise analysis presents reference maximum noise levels at 50 feet for typical construction equipment, which range from 76 dB to 85 dB. These levels are comparable to noise levels generated by operating a vacuum cleaner (typically 80 dBA; BAC 2026). There are no noise sensitive receptors or existing developed land uses within 50 feet of the project site; however, agricultural lands are approximately 200 feet west of the project site and residential properties are approximately 500 feet south of the project site. Maximum noise levels from simultaneous operation of typical construction equipment at 600 feet from the project site were projected to be approximately 63 dBA/Leq/L50 (BAC 2026). Under the projected conditions, the projected noise levels would exceed the City’s daytime and nighttime exterior noise levels for agricultural and residential properties (55 dBA and 50 dBA, respectively; City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.060). However, the City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.080 exempts construction noise from the City’s noise standards if the activity occurs between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Construction which occurs outside of these hours would result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure NOI-01 from the Master EIR would restrict construction hours and require best management practices for minimization of construction noise. Implementation of the mitigation would reduce potentially significant impacts from project temporary construction noise to less than significant.

On-site Operational Noise

Operational noise sources because of the proposed project include building rooftop mechanical equipment for the convenience store; an air/water compressor; delivery truck noise; parking lot noise; and off-site traffic noise from vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Off-site traffic noise is evaluated in the following section. Noise levels from on-site operation of the proposed project exceeding the City’s exterior noise level standards and/or resulting in an increase in noise levels 5 dB or higher over the existing ambient noise levels would be considered a potentially significant impact.

The noise analysis calculated the combined and highest predicted noise levels from on-site operations at the nearest sensitive receptor. Note that the calculated noise levels assume a worst-case scenario which is continuous operation of the air/water unit which would typically operate intermittently and for short duration, and on-site delivery truck activities which would be periodic and relatively short duration. Table 12 presents the existing ambient noise levels, predicted noise levels from on-site operations, and the combined noise levels with ambient and on-site operations with the increase over existing ambient levels shown in parenthesis. The City’s exterior noise level standard is also presented to demonstrate the project’s operations would not exceed the City’s exterior noise level standard at the residential properties south of the project site. Refer to the noise assessment for a detailed breakdown of the on-site operational noise levels.

**Table 12. Cumulative On-site Operational Noise Levels at the Nearest Sensitive Receptor**

Time Period	Existing Ambient Noise Level L50 (dB)	Existing Ambient Noise Level Lmax (dB)	Predicted Project Noise Level L50 (dB)	Predicted Project Noise Level Lmax (dB)	Ambient and Predicted Project Noise Level L50 (dB) <sup>a</sup>	Ambient and Predicted Project Noise Level Lmax (dB) <sup>a</sup>	Applied Exterior Noise Level Standard L50 (dB) <sup>b</sup>	Applied Exterior Noise Level Standard Lmax (dB) <sup>b</sup>
Daytime	48	69	42	52	49.0 (+1.0)	69.1 (+0.1)	55	75
Nighttime	46	66	42	52	47.5 (+1.5)	66.2 (+0.2)	50	70

Source: BAC 2026; City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.060

Notes: The nearest sensitive receptor is south of the project site, adjacent to the single-family residences property boundary. Daytime hours are defined as 7:00 am to 10:pm and nighttime hours are defined as 10:00pm to 7:00am.

- a. The existing ambient and combined project noise level presents noise levels at the sensitive receptor based on existing ambient noise levels and the predicted noise levels of the project when operational with all noise-equipment and activities underway simultaneously. The lowest existing ambient noise level was used, which would represent the greatest potential change in noise levels with the project. The change in noise levels with the project from the existing ambient noise level is shown in parentheses.
- b. The applied exterior noise level standard is from the City of Sacramento Municipal Code Section 8.68.060 as adjusted (see Table 12 of this Initial Study).

**Bold text** indicates an exceedance of the Applied Exterior Noise Limits and/or an increase in noise levels exceeding 5 dBA. dBA = A-weighted decibel; Leq = equivalent continuous sound level (L50 = continuous sound level for 30 minutes).

The predicted noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor indicate that noise generated from project operation would be below ambient noise levels. Noise generated by operation of the project, combined with the existing ambient noise levels would not exceed the City’s exterior noise level standard for agricultural and residential properties at the sensitive receptor, nor would it result in a 5 dB or greater increase in existing ambient noise levels at the sensitive receptor (BAC 2026).

Traffic Noise

Project operations would result in increased traffic volumes on the local roadway network in the vicinity of the project site. Details about how the project would affect traffic circulation are discussed in detail in Section III.14, Transportation and Circulation.

If project-generated traffic would result in increasing in exterior ambient noise levels by 5 dB Ldn or greater at the nearest sensitive receptor, impacts would be potentially significant. The project’s daily trip generation of 2,061 daily vehicle trips was used to calculate a noise level of 44 dB Ldn at the nearest sensitive receptor (note that the daily trip generation used was conservatively based on a 12 fuel position gas station analyzed in the Draft Transportation Analysis [DKS 2018] while the proposed project would have only eight fuel positions and would generate less traffic

– see Section III.14). The average existing ambient noise level is 47 dB Ldn at the sensitive receptor (48 dB Ldn daytime + 46 dB Ldn nighttime /2 = 47 dB Ldn). The increase in noise levels as a result of the project-generated traffic would be approximately 0.2 dB Ldn at the sensitive receptor. This increase is well below the 5 dB Ldn threshold. Impacts on traffic noise levels as a result of the project would be less than significant.

### Summary

Project operations on-site generated noise and the project's contribution to traffic noise would not exceed the City standards. Project construction noise would be potentially significant if noise generating construction activities would occur outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Mitigation measure NOI-1 from the Master EIR would reduce the impact of project construction noise to less than significant.

#### B. Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The Master EIR analyzed whether implementation of the 2040 General Plan would result in excessive construction ground-borne vibration in Impact 4.11-3. The Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2040 General Plan policies and effective review of new projects eliminates or reduces the potential exposure to excessive ground-borne noise and vibration levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Construction and operational activities were evaluated for the potential to generate excessive vibration (BAC 2026). Heavy equipment used during construction would generate localized vibration in the immediate vicinity. As previously mentioned, the level at which humans begin to perceive vibration is at 65 VdB and damage to engineered structures occurs at 98 VdB. A potentially significant impact would occur if vibration would exceed the FTA threshold of 98 VdB or if vibration levels would exceed FTA's groundborne vibration impact criteria based on land uses (refer to Table 10). Maximum vibration levels were calculated for the existing human-occupied structures nearest to the project site: the KFC approximately 60 feet northwest of the project site (Category 3 for FTA's groundborne vibration impact criteria with thresholds of 75 VdB for frequent events, 78 VdB for occasional events, and 83 VdB for infrequent events); and the closest existing residential structure, approximately 550 feet south of the project site (Category 2 for FTA's groundborne vibration impact criteria with thresholds of 72 VdB for frequent events, 75 VdB for occasional events, and 80 VdB for infrequent events).

Predicted maximum vibration levels at the KFC during construction activities ranged from 57 VdB during operation of a small bulldozer at the closest project site boundary to 82 VdB during operation of a large vibratory roller. While below the 98 VdB threshold for potential damage to engineered structures, construction activities could exceed the FTA's groundborne vibration impact criteria for frequent and occasional events at the KFC. Predicted maximum vibration levels at the nearest residential structure south of the project site during construction activities ranged from less than 55 VdB during operation of a small bulldozer at the closest project site boundary to 58 VdB during operation of a large vibratory roller. Vibration levels generated at the nearest residence during construction activities would be well below the level of human perception.

As described in the Master EIR, General Plan Policy ERC 10.5 (Interior Vibration Standards) requires construction activities anticipated to generate excessive vibration to use appropriate methods to ensure acceptable interior vibration levels at nearby residential and commercial land uses are maintained in accordance with FTA's criteria. Vibration generated during construction would be temporary and short term and potential impacts would be less than significant.

During project site visits conducted by BAC on July 31 and August 4, 2025, BAC staff noted that for the existing surrounding land uses similar to the proposed project, vibration levels were below the threshold of perception within the area (BAC 2026). While traffic and trucks traveling on roadways are a source of vibration, they rarely generate vibration amplitudes high enough to cause excessive vibration, and they dissipate rapidly with distance. Vibration and groundborne noise generated during operation would be minimal and impacts would be less than significant.

#### C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public use airport or private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The airports nearest to the project site are Rio Linda Airport and Sacramento McClellan Airport, 3.25 miles and 4.2 miles northeast of the project site, respectively. The project site is not located within the influence areas of the airports, including mapped noise contours (SACOG 2025). The project would not result in human exposure to excessive noise levels from either private airstrips or public airports.

No impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

### Mitigation Measures

**NOI-1: Construction Noise.** The following measure shall be implemented by all construction contractors to reduce the effects of noise levels generated from construction activities.

Construction hours shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Construction outside of these hours may be approved through a development permit based on a site-specific “construction noise mitigation plan” and a finding by the Director of Community Development or their designee that the construction noise mitigation plan is adequate to prevent excessive noise disturbance of affected residential uses. Because it is anticipated that certain construction activities (such as continuous pours of concrete foundations) may require work outside normally permitted construction hours (e.g., overnight), the project’s Development Permit would allow for such construction activities, subject to conditions of approval, including performance standards, imposed by the City to limit noise impacts.

Construction equipment and vehicles shall be fitted with efficient, properly operating noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps) that meet or exceed manufacture specifications. Mufflers and noise suppressors shall be properly maintained and tuned to ensure proper fit, function and minimization of noise.

Impact tools and equipment that are particularly loud (e.g., concrete saws) shall have the working area/impact area shrouded or shielded, with intake and exhaust ports on power equipment muffled or suppressed. The use of temporary or portable, application-specific noise shields or barriers, or temporary construction barriers adjacent to or at the boundary of the construction area may be necessary to reduce associated noise levels.

Construction equipment shall not be idled for extended periods (e.g., 5 minutes or longer) of time in the immediate vicinity of noise-sensitive receptors. Stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors or portable power generators shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed, if needed, to screen stationary noise-generating equipment when located near adjoining noise-sensitive land uses.

For major construction projects: a designated on-site disturbance coordinator shall be designated by the general contractor and shall post contact information in a conspicuous location near the entrance(s) of the construction site, so it is clearly visible to passers-by and nearby receptors. The coordinator shall document and manage complaints resulting from the construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., inoperative muffler) and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Reoccurring disturbances shall be evaluated by a qualified acoustical consultant retained by the project applicant to ensure compliance with applicable standards.

### Findings

All additional potentially significant environmental effects of the project relating to Noise and Vibration can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Noise and Vibration beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**12. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan?			X

**Background and Setting**

Fire

The Sacramento Fire Department provides fire protection services to the entire City and some small areas just outside the City boundaries. The Sacramento Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project site. The fire stations nearest to the project site are: Station 17 at 1311 Bell Avenue, approximately 2.35 miles northeast of the project site, accessible from I-80; Station 20 at 2512 Rio Linda Boulevard, approximately 2.25 miles southeast of the project site in Old North Sacramento; and Station 30 at 1901 Club Center Drive, approximately 2.75 miles northwest of the project site, accessible from I-80 and Natomas Boulevard.

Police

Police protection services are provided by the Sacramento Police Department (SPD) for areas within the City. The SPD provides law enforcement protection to the proposed project site. The project site falls within Police District 1 of the North Command. The North Command station is at 3550 Marysville Boulevard, approximately 2.6 miles southeast of the project site, accessible from I-80 and Marysville Boulevard.

Schools and Libraries

The project site is located within the Twin Rivers Unified School District. The project site is located approximately 0.2 mile north of Garden Valley Elementary School, Rio Tierra Junior High is approximately 0.9 mile northwest of the project site, and Grant Union High School is 2.25 mile east of the project site. The project site is located in an area served by urban levels of library services.

**Standards of Significance**

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan.

**Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies**

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of the 2040 General Plan on various public services. These include police, fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency services (Chapter 4.12). The 2040 General Plan provides that adequate staffing levels for police and fire are important for the long-term health, safety and well-being of the community (Goal PFS 1.1). The Master EIR concluded that effects of development that could occur under the 2040 General Plan would be less than significant.

General plan policies that call for the City to consider impacts of new development on schools (see, for example, Policy YPRO-2.3 setting forth locational criteria, and Policy YPRO-2.2 that encourages joint-use development of facilities) reduce impacts on schools to a less-than- significant level. Impacts on library facilities were considered less than significant (Policy YPRO- 2.4, library services).

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project result in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, or other governmental services beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** According to the Master EIR, implementation of the 2040 General Plan public service policies by individual projects would ensure that adequate public services are available in the City as development and population increase. The project site is within existing service areas for fire and police protection services and would not result in an increase in residents requiring service. Development and operation of the convenience store and fuel station under the proposed project is consistent with the land use identified in the 2040 General Plan and is consistent with the growth assumptions used to evaluate service needs. The proposed project would not result in reduced emergency service response times or substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire or police protection facilities. Because the project would not include population growth, either directly or indirectly, and would not result in an increased demand for schools or other governmental services. The project's potential impacts on public services would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Public Services beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**13. RECREATION**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project: A) Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?			X
B) Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan?			X

**Background and Setting**

The Sacramento Department of Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment (YPCE) maintains and manages 241 parks providing approximately 4,500 acres of recreation space and green space within the City. YPCE classifies parks according to five distinct types: 1) neighborhood parks; 2) community parks; 3) regional parks, 4) parkways; and 5) open space parks. Neighborhood parks typically range from 1 to 8-acres in size and are intended to be used primarily by neighbors within walking or biking distance. Community parks are generally 10 to 40- acres and serve a portion of the City or several neighborhoods within driving distance. Regional parks are large parks that protect unique natural or cultural features, include additional improvements not usually found in local neighborhood and community parks, and/or provide major recreation facilities that attract visitors from across the entire City and beyond. Parkways are linear parks designed primarily for trail use and secondarily for passive recreation, open space, wildlife habitat, and food control. YPCE manages several open space areas to provide river access, ensure access to other natural features, or protect habitat, conserve natural resources, and promote urban greening and ecological functions.

The project site is near two recreational facilities that serve the community: Ninos Parkway and Walter S. Ueda Parkway are each less than 0.5 mile from the project site. These facilities provide open space and recreational amenities which contribute to the overall recreational resources available to the community.

Residential and non-residential projects that are built in the City are required to pay a park development impact fee per Sacramento City Code Chapter 18.56.220. The fees collected pursuant to the code are primarily used to finance the construction of neighborhood and community park facilities. The proposed project would be subject to these fees to finance the design, construction, installation, improvement, and acquisition of park facilities.

**Standards of Significance**

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

- Cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities.
- Create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan.

**Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies**

Chapter 4.12 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2040 General Plan on the City’s existing parkland, urban forest, recreational facilities and recreational services. The General Plan identified a goal of providing an integrated park and recreation system in the City (Goal YPRO-1). New residential development will be required to dedicate land, pay in-lieu fees or otherwise contribute a fair share to the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities (Policy YPRO-1.4). Impacts were considered less than significant after application of the applicable policies.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Would the project cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing area parks or recreational facilities?
- B. Would the project create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan?

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The Master EIR analyzed potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities with implementation of future projects, including the proposed project. Policies were included in the 2040 General Plan to ensure that future residential and non-residential development would not impact existing parks and recreational facilities and to ensure that adequate park and recreational facilities are provided to the residents of Sacramento. The Master EIR concluded that, with implementation of the policies in the 2040 General Plan, future development would not have a significant impact on park and recreational facilities.

Development and operation of the convenience store and fuel station under the proposed project is consistent with the land use designations of the 2040 General Plan and is consistent with the growth assumptions used to evaluate demand on parks and recreational facilities. The proposed project would not accelerate substantial deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities, nor would the proposed project require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan.

The proposed project would not generate population growth that would increase demand for parks or recreational facilities. Thus, the proposed project would not affect the use of existing facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on recreational facilities.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Recreation beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**14. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project: A) Result in a less than 16.8 percent reduction of passenger vehicle VMT per capita compared to the Citywide baseline?			X
B) Adversely affect existing and planned public transit facilities or services, or fail to adequately provide access to transit?			X
C) Adversely affect existing and planned bicycle facilities or fail to adequately provide access by bicycle?			X
D) Adversely affect existing pedestrian facilities or fail to adequately provide access by pedestrians?			X

**Background and Setting**

Per direction received from Matthew Iliagan, City of Sacramento Assistant Civil Engineer, in a pre-application meeting for the proposed project on April 4, 2025, a Draft Transportation Analysis prepared by DKS Associates for retail development of the project site and surrounding parcels was used for the discussion of traffic-related impacts in this section (pers. comm.; DKS 2018). The report is included as Appendix K to this Initial Study. This section also incorporates available new and updated information and discussion where existing conditions have changed since preparation of the Draft Transportation Analysis.

The Draft Transportation Analysis evaluated transportation and circulation-related impacts from a retail development consisting of five parcels, including the parcel for the currently proposed project. The project evaluated for the current project site consisted of a gasoline fuel station with 12 fueling positions, a convenience store, two project driveways, and an on-site driveway connecting with the adjacent parcel northwest of the project site. The project driveways included one two-way driveway connecting with the roadway along the southwestern project site boundary (now Rosin Court), and one right-turn in driveway from westbound Rosin Court southeast of the project site (DKS 2018). The KFC restaurant northwest of the project site was not developed at the time of the Draft Transportation Report but was planned for that parcel and was included in the analysis of the retail development. Because the Draft Transportation Analysis was prepared prior to adoption of the 2040 General Plan, the analysis relied on the goals and policies of the 2035 General Plan which were largely related to level of service at the surrounding intersections and are not part of the analysis contained in this Initial Study. Nonetheless, the Draft Transportation Analysis found that the retail development would not result in level of service impacts at the intersections evaluated (DKS 2018). The evaluation also addressed vehicle miles traveled (VMT), transit, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities which are discussed under Questions B – D, below.

The proposed project is substantially similar to the project evaluated in the Draft Transportation Analysis, with four less fueling positions, and a reconfiguration of the project’s driveways so that both driveways access Rosin Court along the southwest project site boundary and both allow all turning movements.

### Roadway Network

The following provides a description of the existing roadways in the vicinity of the project:

- **I-80** is a major interstate freeway that runs east/west through California. I-5 connects to Northgate Boulevard via a full-access partial cloverleaf interchange approximately 0.27 mile north of the project site.
- **Northgate Boulevard** is a four lane, north/south arterial roadway, intersecting Rosin Court east of the project site. Directly east of the project site, Northgate Boulevard is a divided four lane road with a raised median, two through lanes in each direction, two dedicated left turn lanes in the southbound direction, one dedicated left turn lane in the northbound direction, and one dedicated north-and southbound right turn lane in each direction.
- **Rosin Court** is a local roadway that extends from a dead end northwest of the project site, around the southwest and southeast project site boundaries to the northeast where it terminates in a cul-de-sac at the I-80 ROW, approximately 0.3 mile beyond of the intersection with Northgate Boulevard. The road features one lane in each direction with painted lanes only at the Northgate Boulevard intersection approaches. At its intersection with Northgate Boulevard, east of the project site, Rosin Court features one through-lane in each direction, one dedicated left turn lane in the southwest bound direction, and two dedicated left turn lanes and one dedicated right-turn lane in the northeast bound direction.

The intersection of Northgate Boulevard with Rosin Court is signalized.

### Transit Facilities

As described in the Master EIR, a wide range of transit services are provided in the City. Transit services include public bus service, light rail transit, commercial bus service, and interregional and interstate passenger train service. Park-and-ride facilities are also provided throughout the city to facilitate ridesharing and automobile access to the regional transit system, and carpooling.

Public transit service in the project area is provided by bus and light rail, which are operated by the Sacramento Regional Area Transit (SacRT). The Blue Line light rail provides service in the project area with the Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station approximately 3.6 mile southeast of the project site. Bus routes in the project area include Routes 013, 086, and 113 (SacRT 2025). Routes 013 and 086 have stops at the intersection of Northgate Boulevard and San Juan Road, approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site. Route 013 connects the northwest and eastern areas of the City with Old North Sacramento and the Arden/Del Paso Stations. Route 086 connects the Marconi/Arcade Station with Downtown Sacramento via the I-5 corridor. Route 113 extends from the Natomas Marketplace and Sleep Train Arena approximately 1.9 mile directly northwest of the project site, to the Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station. The SacRT Bus Tracker interactive map identifies bus stops at the southwest and southeast corners of Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court, but with no scheduled stops. The Route 113 bus schedule shows the nearest currently scheduled stops along the route at the intersection of Northgate Boulevard and North Market Boulevard, approximately 0.75 mile north of the project site.

### Bicycle Facilities

The Streets for People Active Transportation Plan identifies existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the project area (City of Sacramento, et. al. 2025; City of Sacramento 2025b). A Class 2B: buffered bike lane is planned along Northgate Boulevard from Rosin Court to North Market Boulevard, and existing Class 2: on-street bike lanes extend north from North Market Boulevard to Del Paso Road (City of Sacramento 2025b). A segment of the Class 2B bike lane has been constructed along southbound Northgate Boulevard from the I-80 interchange to Rosin Court (adjacent to the project site). Northgate Boulevard has existing Class 2: on-street bike lanes from Rosin Court, south to Arden Garden Connector (DKS 2018; City of Sacramento 2025b).

The Natomas East Main Drain Bikeway is a north/south off-street bike path that extends from Sotnip Road in the north to the American River Parkway in the south, passing through the project area approximately 0.2 mile east of the project site. The route is locally accessible via a shared-use pathway at the northeast terminus of Rosin Court.

Additional on-street bicycle routes are planned for Rosin Court, consisting of a Class 3: shared on-street bike route east of Northgate Boulevard and a Class 2: on-street bike lane west of Northgate Boulevard. Rosin Court currently features a dedicated bicycle lane in the northeast bound direction at its intersection with Northgate Boulevard.

### Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities in the project vicinity include paved sidewalks along most of the roadway network.

- North of Rosin Court, existing sidewalks extend along the west side of Northgate Boulevard across I-80, and along the east side of Northgate Boulevard for approximately 400 feet before terminating at the highway-serving commercial center.
- South of Rosin Court, existing sidewalks extend along both sides of Northgate Boulevard, providing access to adjacent commercial and residential areas.
- West of Northgate Boulevard, Rosin Court features a continuous sidewalk along the north and east side of the roadway and a sidewalk on the south side of the roadway, along the McDonald's restaurant frontage. There are no existing sidewalks along the west side of Rosin Court.
- East of Northgate Boulevard, Rosin Court features continuous sidewalks along both sides of the roadway.

### Trip Generation

The Draft Transportation Analysis included trip generation for the anticipated convenience store and fuel station with 12 fueling positions at the project site. The evaluation predicted 2,061 daily trips with 131 during the a.m. peak hour and 168 during the p.m. peak hour. A total of 59 percent of the daily trips, 62 percent of the a.m. peak hour and 56 percent of the p.m. peak hour trips were determined to be pass-by trips (i.e., diverted trips made by motorists while on the way to another destination). The net number of trips generated were 845 daily trips with 50 during the a.m. peak hour and 74 during the p.m. peak hour. Note that the number of trips generated by a fuel station are determined in part by the number of fueling positions (general information about trip generation for fuel stations was provided by Dean Arizabal, Principal Transportation Consultant with LSA in an email dated October 14, 2025). The currently proposed project would include only eight fuel positions and would be expected to result in less trips than were evaluated in the Draft Transportation Analysis.

The anticipated trips for the proposed project were calculated based on the numbers presented in the Draft Transportation Analysis. The proposed project is estimated to generate 1,374 gross daily trips, with 87 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 112 trips during the p.m. peak hour ( $2,061 \text{ daily trips} / 12 \text{ fuel positions} = 171.75 \text{ daily trips per fuel position} \times 8 \text{ fuel positions} = 1,374 \text{ gross daily trips}$ ). Based on the percent trips identified as pass-by trips in the Draft Transportation Analysis, the proposed project would generate 563 net daily trips, with 33 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 49 trips during the p.m. peak hour (205,495 trips per year and 1,776,320 vehicle miles per year).

### Regulatory Framework

Based on current practices from in the City, transportation impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would result in a VMT per capita or office VMT per employee above 85 percent of the regional average, consistent with technical guidance published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR 2018 – note that OPR was renamed to the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation [LUCI] in July 2024). The City developed transportation impact analysis guidelines which recommend the use of "screening thresholds" to determine whether a project may be presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact without conducting a detailed VMT analysis. For residential and office projects, screening criteria include:

- Small Projects – projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day;
- Map-Based Screening – projects located in areas that are known to generate below-average VMT;
- Near Transit Stations – projects within 0.5-mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality corridor; or
- Affordable Residential Development – projects that include affordable housing within an infill location.

## Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to transportation and circulation are considered significant if the proposed project would do any of the following:

- Result in a less than 16.8 percent reduction of passenger vehicle VMT per capita compared to the Citywide baseline.
- Adversely affect existing and planned public transit facilities or services, or fail to adequately provide access to transit.
- Adversely affect existing and planned bicycle facilities or fail to adequately provide access by bicycle.
- Adversely affect existing pedestrian facilities or fail to adequately provide access by pedestrians.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

Chapter 4.14 of the Master EIR considered the effects of the 2040 General Plan on transportation. Various modes of travel were included in the analysis, including vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and aviation components. Provisions of the 2040 General Plan that provide substation guidance include Goal M-4, calling for a transportation system that is effectively planned, managed, operated and maintained, promotion of multimodal choices (Policy M 1.11), and development that encourages walking and biking (Policy M 2.17).

The 2040 General Plan includes numerous policies that direct the development of the City's transportation system, and the Master EIR concluded that these policies would ensure that development would result in less than significant effect to transportation and no mitigation measures were suggested.

## Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Question A. Would the project result in a less than 16.8 percent reduction of passenger vehicle VMT per capita compared to the Citywide baseline?

**No additional significant effect.** The proposed project is 0.27 mile from the I-80 interchange, within the 0.5-mile threshold for projects qualifying as "near transit stations" and is assumed to result in a 16.8 percent or greater reduction of passenger vehicle VMT in accordance with the City's approach to evaluating VMT impacts. OPR's technical guidance notes that new retail development smaller than 50,000 square feet typically redistributes trips rather than creating new trip. As described in the Draft Transportation Analysis, 59 percent of the daily trips are anticipated to be diverted trips made while on the way to another destination (DKS 2018). Furthermore, the proposed project would generate less trips than the numbers projected in the Draft Transportation Analysis since the currently proposed project has 30 percent less fueling positions than the project evaluated in the report (eight fueling positions are proposed under the current project while 12 fueling positions were evaluated in the Draft Transportation Analysis). The approximately 4,761-square-foot convenience store and fueling stations developed under the proposed project would not generate regional trips, rather it would serve motorists already traveling to another destination and would provide a local-serving retail development which may result in shortened trips and reduced VMT. Based on the City's screening thresholds and OPR's technical guidance, the project's impacts on VMT would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

- B. Question B. Would the project adversely affect existing and planned public transit facilities or services, or fail to adequately provide access to transit?

**No additional significant effect.** SacRT provides transit service in the project area. The nearest transit facilities with scheduled stops are bus stops at the intersection of Northgate Boulevard and San Juan Road, approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site. Another bus stop is at Northgate Boulevard and N. Market Boulevard 0.75 mile north of the project site. Transit maps accessed on the SacRT website showed bus stops on Northgate Boulevard at Rosin Court, but with no currently scheduled stops (SacRT 2025).

Implementation of the proposed project could result in an increase in demand for public transportation service for travel to and from the project site by employees and customers; however, the increase in new public transit patrons is not anticipated to be significant since the store would employ 12 individuals who may travel by passenger vehicle, and convenience stores tend to divert customers traveling locally rather than attracting large numbers of customers from outside of the area. The proposed project would not directly impact transit facilities and would not otherwise result in adverse impacts on existing and planned transit facilities. Should bus stops be scheduled at the Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court intersection, the proposed project does not include design elements or land uses that would prevent access to transit. The project's impacts on transit service would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

- C. Question C. Would the project adversely affect existing and planned bicycle facilities or fail to adequately provide access by bicycle?
- D. Question D. Would the project adversely affect existing pedestrian facilities or fail to adequately provide access by pedestrians?

The 2040 General Plan includes goals, objectives, policies and programs to ensure adequate multimodal circulation. The project area includes existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including sidewalks along the project site frontage at Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court and dedicated and shared bicycle lanes along both roadways. The City's Streets for People Active Transportation Plan (City of Sacramento et. al. 2025) planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities in proximity to the project are nearly built out.

The proposed project would incorporate the existing sidewalks along Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court. On-site designated pedestrian access would be provided through minimum 5-foot-wide walkways around the entire perimeter of the convenience store, allowing access to the adjacent parking areas. A sidewalk extending from Northgate Boulevard to the convenience store would provide direct, dedicated pedestrian access to the project site from Northgate Boulevard. A bicycle rack and locker providing two bicycle parking spaces would be installed northwest of the front of the convenience store. The project's pedestrian and bicycle facilities would further support the existing network of sidewalks and bicycle facilities in the area and would enhance multi-modal access to the proposed project and surrounding areas. The project would not adversely affect existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities or fail to provide access by bicyclists and pedestrians. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Transportation and Circulation beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**15. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
<p>Would the project:</p> <p>A) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in PRC 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is:</p> <p>i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources code section 5020.1(k) or</p>			
<p>ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>			

**Background and Setting**

Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 amended CEQA to mandate consultation with California Native American tribes during the CEQA process to determine whether a proposed project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, and that this consideration be made separately from cultural and paleontological resources. Recognizing that California tribes are experts in their tribal cultural resources and heritage, AB 52 requires that CEQA lead agencies carry out consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify tribal cultural resources. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures. By including tribal cultural resources early in the CEQA process, the legislature intended to ensure that local and tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available to identify and address potential adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources.

A tribal cultural resource is a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object which is of cultural value to the tribe. Tribal cultural resources are either listed in or eligible for the CRHR or a local historic register. Tribes may choose not to share information regarding these resources with the public, in accordance with state and/or local laws.

The City has been meeting with the local tribes since completion of the technical background report for the Master EIR in 2020, and meetings are ongoing (City of Sacramento 2024b).

AB 52 Tribal Consultation

Tribal consultation efforts were initiated on March 11, 2026, by the City for the proposed project. The City sent notices to Native American contacts for the following tribes: Buena Vista Band of MeWuk Indians, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, United Auburn Indian Community and the Wilton Rancheria. No responses to the request for consultation were received prior to circulation of this document for public review.

## Standards of Significance

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

- Cause a substantial change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074 and that is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historic resources.
- Create a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in PRC Section 21074 that is a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, including consideration of the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

## Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR evaluated the potential effects of development under the 2040 General Plan on tribal cultural resources (see Chapter 4.15 of the Master EIR). The Master EIR identified significant and unavoidable effects on historic resources and archaeological resources, some of which could be tribal cultural resources as defined in PRC Section 21074. Ground-disturbing activities resulting from implementation of development under the 2040 General Plan could affect the integrity of an archaeological site (which may be a tribal cultural resource), thereby causing a substantial change in the significance of the resource.

Compliance with the required tribal notification and consultation requirements and 2040 General Plan policies along with the implementing actions aimed at protecting tribal cultural resources would help reduce the significance of the impact. However, because no feasible mitigation measures were identified in the Master EIR, the Master EIR concluded that implementation of the 2040 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable effect on tribal cultural resources (Impacts 4.15-1, 2, 3)

## Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
  - i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?
  - ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

**Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.** As described in Section III.5, a CRA was conducted for the project by SWE (SWE 2025). The CRA included a records search at the NCIC, a search of the NAHC's Sacred Lands Files, pedestrian survey, and an evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources as a result of the proposed project. The NAHC responded on July 2, 2025, indicating that the results of the Sacred Lands File search were positive; however, no information on the nature or location of the positive result was provided. The NAHC provided a contact list of 12 individuals representing four Native American tribes and recommended contacting them for more information. Through the AB 52 consultation process, no tribe responded with concerns regarding tribal cultural resources in the project area.

The CRA found the potential for buried cultural resources in the project to be low; however, previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources could be impacted by ground disturbing activities during construction, which would result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires standard measures for inadvertent discovery during construction activities, and Mitigation Measure CUL-3 requires standard measures for inadvertent discovery of human remains during construction activities, including notification to the NAHC. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3 during construction would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures CUL-1, Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training; CUL-2, Inadvertent Discoveries; and CUL-3, Implementation Procedures in the Event of the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

### Findings

All additional potentially significant environmental effects of the project relating to Tribal Cultural Resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant. The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Cultural Resources beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**16. UTILITIES**

Issues:	Effect will be studied in the EIR	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
Would the project: A) Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments?			X
B) Require or result in either the construction of new utilities or the expansion of existing utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			X

**Background and Setting**

Water Supply

Water service for the project would be provided by the City. The City provides domestic water service from a combination of surface water and groundwater sources: the American River, Sacramento River, and groundwater wells (pumped from the North and South American Subbasins). Water from the American River and Sacramento River is diverted by two water treatment plants: the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant, located at 1 Water Street, approximately 3.1-miles southwest of the project site, and the E.A. Fairbairn Water Treatment Plant, located 3065 State University Drive E, approximately 6.3 miles southeast of the project site. Water diverted from the Sacramento and American Rivers is treated, stored in storage reservoirs, and pumped to customers via a conveyance network.

The City complies with the California Water Code, which requires urban water suppliers to prepare and adopt Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years. The most recent UWMP was adopted in 2021 and includes an analysis of water demand sufficiency under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios. Water supply and demand projections include future planned development under the 2040 General Plan. Based, in part, on these projections, the City possesses sufficient water supply entitlements and treatment capacity during normal, dry, and multiple dry years to meet the demands of its customers up to the year 2040. It is important to note that this assumes that wells and surface water treatment capacity will be rehabilitated and expanded as needed (City of Sacramento 2021).

Wastewater

Wastewater collection within the City is provided by both the City and SacSewer. SacSewer serves the Sacramento region and maintains about 35 percent of the public collection system in the City limits, primarily in the northwest and southeast sections of the City, and the City Department of Utilities maintains the remaining 65 percent, which includes combined sewer collection system in the older central City. The combined sewer collection system combines stormwater runoff and sanitary sewage into a single system.

SacSewer also provides wastewater treatment to its entire wastewater collection service area in the Sacramento region, as well as the City's combined sewer collection system during typical operating conditions, via the EchoWater Resource Recovery Facility located near Elk Grove (previously referred to as the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant).

The project site falls within the SacSewer collection and treatment service area; therefore, SacSewer is responsible for providing wastewater/sewage service to the project site. The City's Department of Utilities is responsible for providing and maintaining water, storm drainage, and flood control services for residents and businesses within the City limits.

### Stormwater

The City's separate storm drainage system includes conveyance of storm water and dry weather urban runoff to the adjacent creeks and rivers. The separate drainage system consists of street drains, conveyance systems, and usually a pump station to discharge into either a Sacramento or American River. These discharges are regulated for water quality by the Regional Water Quality Control Board NPDES permit.

### Solid Waste Disposal

Commercial solid waste materials collected by the Solid Waste Division of the City Public Works Department are sorted at either the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station (owned by BLT Enterprise) or the North Area Transfer Station, owned by the County of Sacramento Public Works Department; City waste transported from the City's transfer stations is then transported to Lockwood Landfill in Lockwood, Nevada. The Master EIR indicates that the City landfills have sufficient capacity for full buildout of the 2040 General Plan.

### Electricity and Natural Gas

SMUD is responsible for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical power to its 900-square-mile service area, which includes most of Sacramento County and a small portion of Placer County. SMUD buys and sells energy and capacity on a short-term basis to meet load requirements and reduce costs. PG&E provides natural gas service to residents and businesses within the City. The project would not use natural gas.

### Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this Initial Study, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to utilities and service systems beyond what was anticipated in the 2040 General Plan:

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

### Summary of Analysis under the 2040 General Plan Master EIR and Applicable General Plan Policies

The Master EIR evaluated the effects of development under the 2040 General Plan on water supply, sewer and storm drainage, solid waste, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications. See Chapter 4.13.

The Master EIR evaluated the impacts of increased demand for water that would occur with development under the 2040 General Plan. Policies in the 2040 General Plan would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. The potential need for expansion of wastewater treatment facilities was identified as having a less than significant effect. Impacts on solid waste facilities were less than significant. Implementation of energy efficient standards as set forth in CCR Titles 20 and 24 for residential and non-residential buildings, would reduce effects for energy to a less than significant level.

### Answers to Checklist Questions

- A. Result in the determination that adequate capacity is not available to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments.

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The demand for utilities during operation of the convenience store and fuel station are evaluated in the following paragraphs.

#### *Water Supply*

The City is responsible for providing and maintaining water supply to the project site. The City's most recent 2020 UWMP (City of Sacramento 2021) presents historic water use, 2020 actual water use, and projected water demands through 2050 by sector. The proposed project would fall within the "Commercial (and Industrial)" sector as defined in the UWMP. The City's per capita water use target for 2020 was 225 gpcd. The proposed project would have 12 employees during operation which would have a water use target of approximately 2,700 gallons of water per day (225 gpcd x 12 employees/visitors). Based on usage for similar projects, the proposed project is anticipated to use approximately 438.9 gallons of water per day, which would be well below the per capita water use for the project.

As described in the Master EIR, the 2020 UWMP projected water demands through 2050, beyond the development envisioned in the 2040 General Plan, including the effects of up to a five-year drought at any period between 2025 and 2045. The evaluation found that water supplies comfortably exceed water demands. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designations of the 2040 General Plan, and, as a result, the water demand from development of the project is within the capacities anticipated within the City's 2020 UWMP and analyzed in the Master EIR. The project's impact on water supply would be less than significant.

#### *Wastewater and Stormwater*

The project site falls within the SacSewer wastewater collection and treatment service area and the City's separate stormwater drainage system. SacSewer is responsible for sewer collection and wastewater treatment in the project area. As described in the Master EIR, SacSewer has identified capacity needs in its collection infrastructure, primarily in the northern area of the SacSewer service area. The System Capacity Plan 2020 Update identifies existing and planned system areas with capacity deficiencies, and the project site is not located within any of those system areas (see Figures 5-1 through 5-4 in SacSewer 2020). The EchoWater Resource Recovery Facility is anticipated to have sufficient capacity for future development under the 2040 General Plan (the facility is referred to as the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant in the 2040 General Plan).

Using the population-based flow factor identified in Section 4.11, Public Utilities, of the Master EIR of 132 gpcd, the project would result in an increased demand of a maximum of 1,584 gallons per day (132 gpcd x 12 employees/visitors).

Wastewater and stormwater services would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designations of the 2040 General Plan, and as a result, the wastewater and stormwater demand from development of the project are within the capacities anticipated within the Master EIR. The project's impact on wastewater and stormwater would be less than significant.

#### *Solid Waste*

Commercial solid waste is collected by private franchised haulers and disposed of at various facilities including the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station, the Sacramento County Kiefer Landfill, the Yolo County Landfill, L and D Landfill, Florin Perkins Landfill, Elder Creek Transfer Station and the Sacramento County North Area Recovery Station. General contractors and industrial solid waste generators often haul solid waste directly to disposal facilities (City of Sacramento 2024a). The Master EIR concluded that local landfills have adequate capacity for full buildout of the 2040 General Plan. The Master EIR provides solid waste generation rates for residential and employment (retail, office, industrial uses). For employment use, the solid waste generation is 10.8-pounds per employee per day. The proposed project would have 12 employees; therefore, the proposed project would generate 130-pounds per day of waste (10.8 pounds per employee per day x 12 occupants). This would equate to a maximum of 47,304 pounds, or 24 tons, of waste per year.

Because the project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan land use designation, this solid waste production would not exhaust the remaining landfill capacity and the project's impacts on solid waste would be less than significant.

#### *Electricity and Natural Gas*

SMUD provides electricity to the project site and PG&E provides natural gas. The proposed project would not include the use of natural gas, but it would result in an increased demand on electricity from SMUD. As described in the Master EIR, energy service providers would be responsible for ensuring adequate levels of service to the project site according to California Public Utilities Commission rules. The proposed project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan land use designation, the increased demand in energy is evaluated in the Master EIR. The project's impact on energy would be less than significant.

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

**No additional significant environmental effect.** The proposed project would connect with existing water, sanitary sewer and storm drain facilities located within Rosin Court west of the project site. The project would connect to an existing SMUD transformer west of the Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court intersection. Refer to the Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C3) in Appendix D. Note that although a natural gas connection is shown on the site plan, it is included in error, and natural gas would not be used for the project.

The proposed project would not exceed the demand or result in the need for relocation or construction of new utility facilities beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR. As described in the Master EIR, if energy service providers need to install new facilities associated with the 2040 General Plan, the installation of new facilities would be

analyzed by each development under separate environmental review as the utilities are extended. In addition, this project is also subject to the City's Development Impact Fees. On October 24, 2023, and November 14, 2023, City Council adopted Resolutions 2023-0338 and 2023-0368, respectively, to adjust the Water System, Sewer, and Combined Sewer Development Fees, as well as to establish the Storm Drainage Development Fee to align with updated Nexus Studies. The proposed project would result in less than significant Impacts associated with relocation or construction of new utilities facilities and would result in no additional environmental effects beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Findings

The project would have no additional project-specific environmental effects relating to Utilities beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Issues:	Effect remains significant with all identified mitigation	Effect can be mitigated to less than significant	No additional significant environmental effect
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?		X	
B) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X	
C) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X	

Answers to Checklist Questions

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

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** As discussed in Section III.4, Biological Resources, the project could result in potentially significant impacts to burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, and nesting birds if present in the project site or area. Furthermore, the project is located within the NBHCP area with requirements to minimize impacts on species covered under the NBHCP and provide land impact fees as compensatory mitigation for development within the NBHCP area. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4 and BIO-5, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3 would address inadvertent discovery of unknown cultural resources during construction and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures to be incorporated into the proposed project, the project would 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, 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 pre-history. There would be no additional significant environmental effects beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** While the proposed project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and surrounding areas, these impacts have been previously evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City’s 2040 General Plan. The potential of the proposed project with the cumulative projects, to contribute to cumulative impacts with regard to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, tribal cultural resources and traffic and transportation are described below.

**Aesthetics.** The proposed project and cumulative project would not be located near a scenic resource or along a scenic route. Together, the projects would not exacerbate the level of significance of the project on scenic views, and the development would be consistent with the surrounding urban development. The individual projects would not combine to result in a cumulatively significant impact related to aesthetics, and the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.

**Air Quality.** As discussed in Section III.3, Air Quality, construction and long term operation of the proposed project would not exceed daily or annual thresholds for criteria pollutants and would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TACs. The notably low number of net daily trips generated by the project would result in emissions well below the daily and annual thresholds of significance. However, if the project does not comply with SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices during construction, impacts to air quality would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would be implemented to require compliance and the project’s impacts would be less than significant. The individual projects would not result in cumulatively significant impacts related to air quality and the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant.

**Biological Resources.** As discussed in Section III.4, Biological Resources, the project would result in potentially significant impacts to burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, and nesting birds if using the project site or surrounding areas. Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 would avoid impacts through pre-construction surveys, light control, and avoidance measures. Furthermore, the project is within the NBHCP area which requires avoidance and minimization of impacts to species covered under the NBHCP and payment of impact fees for development within the NBHCP area. Mitigation Measure BIO-4 requires general preconstruction surveys for covered species in compliance with the NBHCP and Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires payment of development impact fees for the proposed project. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources would be less than significant.

**Cultural Resources.** As discussed in Section III.5, Cultural Resources, the project would result in potentially significant impacts to historic and prehistoric archaeological resources, including human burials, if previously undiscovered resources are encountered during construction. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, impacts would be reduced to levels of less than significant. The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

**GHGs.** As discussed in Section III.8, GHG Emissions, the project would not result in GHG emissions exceeding SMAQMD significance thresholds, and the project would be consistent with the City’s CAAP regarding measures to reduce GHG emissions. The project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on GHG emissions would be less than significant.

**Noise and Vibration.** As discussed in Section III.11, Noise and Vibration, construction activities would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce the potential for significant noise impacts to a level of less than significant. The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on noise would be less than significant.

**Tribal Cultural Resources.** As discussed in Section III.15, Tribal Cultural Resources, the project would result in potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources if previously undiscovered resources are encountered during construction. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, impacts would be reduced to levels of less than significant. The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

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

**Effect can be mitigated to less than significant.** Project-related effects on human beings would be primarily related to air quality, odor, and noise. As described in Section III.3, Air Quality, if the project does not comply with SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices during construction, impacts would be potentially significant but would be reduced to below a level of significance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would be implemented to require compliance, the project's impact on air quality and odor would be less than significant. As described in Section III,11, Noise and Vibration, construction activities would result in a potentially significant impact related to noise but would be reduced to below a level of significance with Mitigation Measure NOI-1. With the proposed mitigation, there would be no additional significant environmental effects beyond what was analyzed in the Master EIR.

**SECTION IV - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**


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

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology, Water Quality, and Flooding
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise and Vibration
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Circulation
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Public Safety	
<input type="checkbox"/> None Identified	

**SECTION V - DETERMINATION**

On the basis of the Initial Study:

I find that (a) the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the Master EIR; (b) the proposed project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan land use designation and the permissible densities and intensities of use for the project site; (c) that the discussions of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects in the Master EIR are adequate for the proposed project; and (d) the proposed project will have additional significant environmental effects not previously examined in the Master EIR. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR will be applied to the project as appropriate, and additional feasible mitigation measures and alternatives will be incorporated to revise the proposed project before the negative declaration is circulated for public review, to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a level of insignificance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b)).



May 15, 2026

---

Signature

Date

Charles Tschudin, Senior Planner

---

Printed Name

## SECTION VI - REFERENCES CITED

### 1. REFERENCES

- Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. (BAC) . 2026. Environmental Noise & Vibration Assessment for the 7-Eleven Northgate Blvd & Rosin Ct, Sacramento, California. April 30, 2026.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/2022-scoping-plan-documents>
- California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2022. Gasoline Service Station Industry-wide Risk Assessment Guidelines.
2009. Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects.
- California Department of Conservation (CDC)
- 2025a. Landslide Inventory Online Maps. Accessed on November 17, 2025 at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/lsi/app/>
- 2025b. California Geological Survey California Mineral Resources Data Portal. Accessed on November 17, 2025 at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/?page=All-Data>  
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/mineral-land-classification-smara>
2018. California Geological Survey Mineral Land Classification Map of Concrete Aggregate in the Greater Sacramento Area Production-Consumption Region.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2025. EnviroStor. Accessed on November 17, 2025 at: [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global\\_id=57420005#Stor\\_Map](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global_id=57420005#Stor_Map).
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2018. State Scenic Highways. Available from: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed on November 17, 2025.
- California Energy Commission. 2023. California Retail Fuel Outlet Annual Reporting (CE-A15) Results.
- California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. March 6, 2015.
- DKS Associates (DKS). 2018. Transportation Analysis Retail at Northgate and Rosin Court. August 18, 2018.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2025. Flood Map Service Center. Accessed on December 7, 2025 at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>
- Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). 2025. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Important Farmland classifications accessed on November 17, 2025 at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/>
- Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). 2025. Company Information. Accessed on November 17, 2025 at: <https://www.pge.com/en/about/company-information.html>.
- RCH Group, Inc. 2026. Air Quality Technical Report for the Sacramento Northgate Rosin 7-Eleven. April 28, 2026.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2025. Sacramento District Website: Natomas Basin. Accessed on December 7, 2025 at: <https://www.spk.usace.army.mil/natomas/>.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2025. Airport Comprehensive Land Use Planning & Maps. Maps for McClellan Air Force Base and Rio Linda Airport accessed on November 18, 2025 at: <https://www.sacog.org/planning/land-use/airport-planning/comprehensive-land-use-planning-maps>.
2019. 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. Adopted November 18, 2019.
- Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer). 2020. System Capacity Plan 2020 Update. December 2020.
- Sacramento, City of (City of Sacramento). 2025a. City of Sacramento Land Information Lookup App. Accessed on November 17, 2025 at: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/426bbcca678342c6abf3855df7e0dc1a>
- 2025b. City of Sacramento Public Bike Master Plan Viewer. Accessed on December 5, 2025 at:

<https://saccity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/interactivelegend/index.html?appid=2dff1a25e17b4c6e828f837c8a6b3015>.

2024a. Sacramento 2040 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. Adopted February 27, 2024.

2024b. 2040 General Plan. Adopted February 27, 2024.

2024c. Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). Adopted February 27, 2024.

2021. City of Sacramento 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2021.

Sacramento, City of, et. al. (City of Sacramento, et. al.) 2025. Streets for People: Sacramento's Active Transportation Plan. Final Plan August 2025. Adopted December 2, 2025 (Resolution No. 2025-0319).

Sacramento, City of, et. al. (City of Sacramento, et. al.) 2003. Final Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. April 2003.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD).

2021. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento. April 2021.

2020a. CEQA Guide. Chapter 1: Introduction and Air Quality. Available at:  
<https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch1IntroAq4-25-2020.pdf>.

2020b. CEQA Guide. Chapter 2 Appendix: Thresholds of Significance Table. Available at:  
<https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable4-2020.pdf>.

2019. Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices. Revised July. Available at:  
<http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch3BasicEmissionControlPracticesBMPSFinal7-2019.pdf>.

2016. CEQA Guide Chapter 7: Odors. Available at:  
<https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch7Odors%20FINAL6-2016.pdf>2016.pdf.

Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD). 2025. Company Information. Accessed on December 7, 2025 at:  
<https://www.smud.org/en/Corporate/About-us/Company-Information>.

Sacramento Regional Area Transit (SacRT). 2025. Route, schedule and trip planner information accessed on December 5, 2025 at: <https://www.sacrt.com/>.

Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership. 2018. Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region. July 2018. Available at: <https://www.beriverfriendly.net/stormwater-quality-design-manual/>

SALEM Engineering Group, Inc. (SALEM). 2025a. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation: Proposed 7-Eleven C-Store & Fuel Station, Northwest Corner of Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court, Sacramento, California. July 11, 2025.

2025b. Phase I Environmental Assessment: Proposed 7-Eleven Fueling Station 3781 Northgate Boulevard, Sacramento, California. July 29, 2025.

Stringer Biological Consulting, Inc. (SBC). 2025. Biological Resources Evaluation for the 7-Eleven Convenience Store and Fuel Station, Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court, City of Sacramento, California. October 30, 2025.

SummitWest Environmental, Inc. (SWE). 2025. Cultural Resources Assessment 7-11 Northgate Boulevard and Rosin Court, Sacramento, California. October 31, 2025.

## **2. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION**

Sacramento, City of (City of Sacramento), Matthew Iliagan, Assistant Civil Engineer, verbal communication during a meeting on April 4, 2025.

LSA, Dean Arizabal, Principal Transportation Planner, email to Catherine Silvester regarding trip generation for fuel stations dated October 14, 2025.

**SECTION VII – PREPARERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Role, Responsibility</b>
Catherine Silvester	Point View Environmental	Project Manager, Lead Preparer
Dave Claycomb, AICP	Green Valley Planning, LLC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
Mike Ratte	The RCH Group	Sections III.3 Air Quality; III.6 Energy; and III.8 Greenhouse Gases