

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed McKinley Village Project (proposed project) in the City of Sacramento (City). The proposed project includes development of a 328-unit residential project along with parks and a neighborhood recreation center on an approximately 48.75-acre site located in the City. A detailed description of the project and all its components is contained in Chapter 2, Project Description.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This summary chapter provides an overview of the technical analysis of the project's environmental effects contained in Sections 4.1 through 4.10 in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis. This summary also includes an overview of: (a) effects found to be less than significant, (b) comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), (c) potential areas of controversy, (d) potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce identified significant impacts, and (e) alternatives to the proposed project. Each of these issues is discussed in detail in this Draft EIR.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15382 defines a significant effect as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to the environment. As lead agency, the City determined that this Draft EIR will address the following technical issue areas:

- Air Quality and Climate Change
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Public Safety
- Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage
- Noise and Vibration
- Public Services and Recreation
- Public Utilities
- Transportation and Circulation
- Urban Design and Visual Resources.

The specific topics evaluated are described in each of the technical sections presented in Chapter 4. Land Use, Planning and Housing are not considered technical issues and are addressed in Chapter 3. As noted in those chapters, all project impacts have been reduced to less than significant after mitigation.

A brief summary of the findings in Chapter 3, and each of the technical sections in Chapter 4 is included below followed by a discussion of those issue areas determined to be less than significant and therefore not further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Land Use, Planning and Population

This chapter of the Draft EIR describes existing and planned land uses in and adjacent to the project site, current land uses, 2030 General Plan land use designations, and zoning, and analyzes the consistency of the proposed project with existing land use plans and policies as well as land use compatibility with adjacent lands. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d) provides that the environmental setting of an EIR must discuss “any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.” Potential inconsistencies between the proposed project and the City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan, the East Sacramento Community Plan (a subset of the General Plan), the City of Sacramento General Plan 2008–2013 Housing Element (adopted November 18, 2008), and the City of Sacramento Zoning Ordinance are discussed in this chapter.

The analysis concludes that the proposed project would be consistent with the intent of the City’s 2030 General Plan and East Sacramento Community Plan and would be compatible with the existing adjacent uses. In addition, the project is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ (SACOG’s) Blueprint and Metropolitan Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (see Appendix N for a copy of the letter from SACOG). Population generated by the project is anticipated in the City’s Housing Element and would not result in any plan inconsistencies.

Air Quality and Climate Change

This section describes the project’s impacts on local and regional air quality and contribution to regional air quality conditions. The analysis evaluates construction and operational air emissions associated with the project. A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared that evaluated potential impacts to human health associated with exposure to toxic air contaminants associated with the adjacent Capital City Freeway and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks (see Appendix C). Construction-related activities are considered short-term and include site clearing, grading, and the use of construction equipment that would generate air pollutants. Operational impacts associated with an increase in vehicle trips and use of consumer equipment was also evaluated. The analysis was prepared in compliance with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) guidelines. The section also evaluates the project’s impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and climate change. A Climate Action Plan checklist was prepared for the project that evaluated the project’s consistency with the City’s Climate Action Plan (see Appendix G).

An increase in construction-related air emissions and dust would exceed the SMAQMD thresholds resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1, Air Quality and Climate Change and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. The project would not result in any long-term operational impacts. The project would also not result in impacts associated with placing residences in close proximity to the freeway and UPRR tracks that generate toxic air contaminants. The proposed project would not result in any cumulative impacts to air quality or climate change.

Biological Resources

This section evaluates the potential effects on biological resources associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The biological resources present within the project site are described and special-status plant and wildlife species that could occur within the project site are identified. Potential impacts to biological resources associated with proposed off-site improvements are also evaluated. Numerous biological surveys were prepared for the project to determine the presence or absence of species and are reported and discussed in this section.

There are no wetlands, heritage trees, special-status plant species, with the exception of elderberry shrubs, or wildlife corridors present on the site; therefore, the project would not impact these resources. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.2, Biological Resources, and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on nesting birds, foraging habitat for protected raptors, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat.

Cultural Resources

The cultural resources section describes the existing historic and archaeological resources within the project site and evaluates the potential for unknown resources to exist. A Cultural Resource Assessment for the project was prepared along with an architectural assessment of the A Street Bridge (see Appendices E and F). No structures exist on the project site so there are no potential impacts to historic resources associated with the demolition of an existing building.

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with the potential to unearth unknown historic or archaeological resources during site construction. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Cultural Resources, and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, would reduce project impacts on cultural resources to less than significant.

Hazards and Public Safety

This section describes the potential adverse effects on human health and the environment due to exposure to hazards that could result from construction and operation of the proposed project. Hazards evaluated include those associated with hazardous materials, such as potential exposure to hazardous materials used, generated, stored, or transported in or adjacent to the project site, and existing identified or suspected soil and/or groundwater contamination associated with proximity to the former 28th Street Landfill. Public safety hazards addressed include proximity to the UPRR tracks, emergency access, and potential hazards associated with a train derailment.

The proposed project would not use, transport or store any hazardous materials other than common household products. Implementation of applicable hazardous materials management laws and regulations adopted at the federal, state, and local level would ensure impacts related to such hazardous materials use remain less than significant. Impacts associated with soil or groundwater contamination would be less than significant. Hazards to public safety associated with proximity to the freeway and the UPRR tracks and the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials or train derailment were determined to be less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage

This section describes the existing hydrology, drainage and water quality of the project site and identifies infrastructure improvements associated with the proposed project. The increase in impervious surface area and the potential for an increase in localized flooding is evaluated along with hazards associated with a levee or dam failure.

Based on the Master Drainage Plan prepared for the project site (see Appendix J) and assuming compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations, impacts associated with construction-related surface water quality, water quality degradation associated with urban runoff, and increased peak stormwater flows would all be less than significant. The project site is located in an area designated as having 100-year flood protection so impacts associated with flooding were determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts associated with emergency evacuation in the event of a regional flood were also determined to be less than significant due, in part, to specific conditions the project is proposing to include and compliance with the City's evacuation procedures and plans.

Noise and Vibration

The Noise section describes the existing ambient noise environment and evaluates changes to noise associated with construction and operation of the project. In addition, the noise analysis evaluates existing noise and vibration associated with the adjacent Capital

City Freeway and UPRR tracks on future project residents. Based on the noise analysis prepared for the project, compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and 2030 General Plan policies would ensure impacts (noise and vibration) associated with project construction would be less than significant. Noise associated with project operation, including an increase in vehicles on local roadways and noise from onsite uses would not exceed City thresholds; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Noise associated with the freeway would also not exceed acceptable City thresholds for interior and exterior uses resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Noise and vibration associated with the adjacent UPRR tracks would exceed interior noise thresholds; however, implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.6, Noise and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures that requires specific building materials be used for those residences proposed adjacent to the UPRR embankment would help ensure the impact would be less than significant.

Public Services and Recreation

This section describes existing public services (fire and police protection, schools, and parks) that would serve the project site and identifies anticipated demand for these services resulting from development of the proposed project and the increase in a residential population. The project site is located within the Twin Rivers Unified School District, but is adjacent to the Sacramento City Unified School District. The analysis addresses potential impacts to schools in both districts.

The project would not result in any impacts to fire and police services that would require the need to construct new facilities or to expand existing facilities to house more staff required to serve the project. For schools, the project does not exceed capacity or trigger the need to construct new facilities at either district under existing school enrollments, so impacts to schools are less than significant. Pursuant to SB 50, the project applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. This payment is considered full mitigation for any impacts to school services that would result from a project. In addition, the project can mitigate any potential impacts to City parks through payment of in-lieu fees, also reducing the impact to less than significant.

Public Utilities

This section describes the utility systems and facilities within the project area and potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project. Utilities and service systems considered in the analysis include water supply, wastewater treatment and collection, and solid waste collection and disposal. This section also describes the existing energy resources derived from petroleum products, electricity, and natural gas available within the project area and analyzes impacts related to energy resources resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to an increased demand for public services and utilities in the City of Sacramento. However, the increase in demand would not exceed capacity or exceed City projections; therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

This section describes potential impacts to the transportation system near the proposed project site. The impact analysis examines the roadway, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and construction components of the overall transportation system under existing conditions, existing plus project, cumulative, and cumulative plus project conditions.

The proposed project would increase traffic on local roadways and intersections during project construction and operation. During project construction there is the potential for degraded roadway operation conditions to occur. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8, Transportation and Circulation and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures would reduce the impact to less than significant. During project operation, under existing plus project conditions, the level of service (LOS) on area roadways would not exceed the City's standard. Intersections would also continue to operate under acceptable levels with the exception of the H Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersection that experiences an unacceptable LOS during the AM peak hour. With mitigation included in Section 4.9 and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures this impact is reduced to less than significant. Impacts to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities under existing plus project and cumulative plus project conditions are all less than significant. Under cumulative plus project conditions the project would contribute to an unacceptable LOS at the E Street/Alhambra Boulevard and H Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersections during the AM and PM peak hours. Mitigation included in Section 4.9 and in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

This section describes the existing visual setting of the project site and vicinity and evaluates potential impacts related to implementation of the proposed project. The analysis considers whether the project would substantially degrade the visual character of the project area, adversely affect sensitive receptors, or create new sources of light and glare that would adversely affect views and visual conditions in the area.

The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the project site by developing a residential neighborhood with trees and landscape on land that is currently undeveloped and that has four lighted billboards. While the project would change the visual character of the site, this change is not considered a significant impact. The site has been designated by the City for urban development, and the change in character from vacant land to a developed site is not in itself a significant effect. The existing UPRR embankment blocks views from existing

developed areas to the south, east, and west, and development of the project would not adversely affect any sensitive receptors. Views from the north along the freeway are only visible to motorists heading eastbound. The existing concrete median essentially blocks views of the project site for motorists heading westbound. The project would contribute to the existing ambient light in the area by introducing new street and building lights; however, the addition of light would be subject to design restriction to avoid glare, and would not affect adjacent areas and would not result in a significant impact.

EFFECTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Due to certain aspects of the project, project characteristics, or existing regulatory requirements, the project is not anticipated to have significant impacts on the following resources: agricultural resources, forestry resources, geology, soils or mineral resources. The following provides an overview that explains why the project would not adversely affect these resources and therefore these resources are not further analyzed in this Draft EIR.

Agricultural Resources

The project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance on the Department of Conservation Important Farmland Maps (DOC 2012). The City's recently adopted 2030 General Plan includes policies that encourage the preservation of existing local agricultural lands and operations in areas outside of the City. These policies include Policy ER 4.2.1, which encourages infill development and compact new development within the existing urban areas of the City in order to prohibit the premature conversion of productive agricultural lands for urban uses, and Policy ER 4.2.3, which ensures that the City continues to work with Sacramento County and other adjacent jurisdictions to ensure implementation of all existing conservation plans to preserve prime farmland outside the City.

The Master EIR (MEIR) prepared for the 2030 General Plan identified approximately 1,860 acres of Farmland of Local Importance within the City. As an urban jurisdiction, the City of Sacramento intends to develop all land within its boundaries. Although the City still contains agricultural land or land designated as Important Farmland, much of this land within the City has been designated and zoned for development, and in many instances, has been entitled for future development. It is the City's policy to limit the conversion of agricultural lands outside of the City limits. By keeping development within established growth areas, the City seeks to limit urban sprawl into other agricultural regions, thereby helping to minimize or reduce impacts on agricultural resources and operations in more agriculturally productive areas. Infrastructure already exists or is planned for undeveloped areas within the City, signaling the City's intention for urban growth to occur. As stated in the MEIR, the City's contribution to the state's inventory of Important Farmland is insubstantial, and the City has determined that the remaining agricultural land within the City boundaries is not considered viable or suitable for large scale agricultural operations. The MEIR

concluded that impacts to agricultural resources that could occur with implementation of the 2030 General Plan were less than significant. Likewise, any impacts on agricultural resources and operations from project development would be less than significant.

Forestry Resources

There are no trees within the project boundaries or in the areas designated for off-site improvements that would be considered timberland or forest land. Forestry resources or forest land is typically defined as land covered with forests or reserved for the growth of forests. Construction of the project would not result in the loss of protected forestry resources, and no impact would occur.

Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

The project site is located in Sacramento County and is classified as a low severity earthquake zone. There are no known active faults within the greater Sacramento region and the project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure, and liquefaction. There are no regulated Earthquake Fault Zones or mapped seismic hazard zones in the city. All development in California is subject to the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC contains more stringent building standards than the Uniform Building Code, specific to conditions in California.

The project site is generally flat and does not contain any slopes steep enough to present a landslide hazard during construction or operation of the project. During construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential ground movement. A Geotechnical Report was prepared for the project site in September 2006 by Wallace Kuhl and Associates to assess the soils on the site to determine any potential constraints for construction. A total of 40 test borings were taken up to depths of 21.5 feet below existing grade level. Soils encountered within the upper 7 to 10 feet of the surface consist of soft silty clays and clayey silts. Groundwater was encountered at depths between 6 to 18 feet below existing grade level. The areas of shallower groundwater are located in the western portion of the site. Dewatering may be required during project construction depending upon the depth of excavation (WKA 2006). For more information see Section 4.5, Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage. The project would not import or export fill during project construction.

The City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan does not identify the project site as being located in a sensitive geologic area that could expose people to potential geologic impacts. Grading activities associated with project construction would result in the disruption, displacement, compaction, and over covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). There are no notable topographic features on the site. Any grading activities would be limited to the project site and all grading and improvement plans would be reviewed by the

City's Department of Utilities in compliance with the Sacramento City Code Chapters 15.20 (Uniform Building Code) and 15.88, (Grading and Erosion Sediment Control), for consistency with the City's development standards. Grading activities would require a grading permit from the Department of Utilities, which requires including the provision of proper drainage and appropriate dust control and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures would be incorporated into the required grading plans. Project construction is subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Compliance with the requirements of the City Code and the federal NPDES, and the limited exposure of soils anticipated, the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is less than significant.

Additionally, the City's 2030 General Plan finds such impacts to be less than significant since new buildings and structures are required to comply with all applicable state and local building codes.

The project includes the improvement of A Street from 28th Street to the project site. Concerns were raised from the public that a portion of A Street would be developed on an area underlain by the former 28th Street Landfill. A roadway extending east from the intersection of 28th Street and A Street through the Landfill site and over the Capital City Freeway is currently contemplated in the City's 2030 General Plan as part of the Sutter's Landing Parkway Interchange, and in the Sutter's Landing Park Master Plan. This issue is analyzed in Sections 4.4, Hazards and Public Safety and 4.9, Transportation and Circulation.

The project site is not identified by the City as containing mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance and development would not have any impacts on mineral resources. The proposed project would not include excavation of mineral resources on the site and would have no impacts related to mineral resources (City of Sacramento 2009).

COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE 2008 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Comments received in response to the 2008 NOP that sought comments on the prior project and proposed land use plan are summarized below. The City received a total of 18 comment letters. Several comments expressed concern associated with an increase in vehicle traffic and train traffic. Other comments included concerns regarding an increase in noise associated with project traffic and the possible effects on air quality both associated with project related traffic as well as potential impacts on the health of future residents.

Air Quality

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) suggested preparing an Air Quality Mitigation Plan, if the project would result in any significant operational air quality impacts. SMAQMD also requested the Draft EIR include a discussion on climate change, and use the Recommended Protocol for Evaluating the Location of Sensitive Land Uses Adjacent to

Major Roadways (Roadway Protocol) in the air quality analysis. SMAQMD also recommended addressing air quality associated with the nearby railroad operations and including mitigation strategies in the Draft EIR to minimize both railroad and freeways emissions to future residents.

The East Sacramento Preservation Task Force raised questions about health concerns due to proximity of the freeway and UPRR tracks to future residents. The comment also suggested preparing a health risk analysis.

Biological Resources

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) indicated the project could have an impact to fish and/or wildlife habitat. The CDFW provided comments and suggestions for impact reduction and analysis.

Hydrology and Water Quality

One comment requested the Draft EIR address potential flood impacts in East Sacramento from the proposed railroad underpass.

The East Sacramento Preservation Task Force expressed concern associated with a potential increase in flood hazards in East Sacramento, given the approval of an underpass through the railroad embankment.

The State Water Resources Control Board provided comments regarding required permits and guidance for water quality planning, and low impact development strategies.

Public Services and Recreation

One comment raised concern regarding access for people with disabilities. The comment requested the project provide the Americans with Disabilities access within Sutter's Landing Park. An additional comment requested the Draft EIR include alternate uses for retail and office space along Lanatt Street.

The East Sacramento Preservation Task Force requested consideration of additional commercial services, including locating public transit within the project site, and indicated the project is too auto-centric.

Public Utilities

The East Sacramento Preservation Task Force raised concerns that additional services required for stormwater management and the integration of new utilities with the existing site would be required.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) requested any pre-project or post-project hydraulic plans be forwarded to their agency. Caltrans stated any increased discharge

into the drainage system must be mitigated. The agency also indicated an Encroachment Permit would be required for any work conducted in the state's ROW.

Noise

Caltrans recommended that noise levels be analyzed and appropriate mitigation measures be developed if necessary. Another comment expressed concern associated with construction noise.

Transportation

Comments expressed concern for the possible increased traffic on 28th Street and the subsequent effects on the surrounding residential neighborhood.

The California Public Utilities Commission noted a Traffic Impact Study should be performed at the crossing of 28th Street and B Street and for project-related rail safety impacts.

The McKinley East Sacramento Neighborhood Association (MENA) raised concerns associated with the increase in traffic and its effects on the livability of local residents in the area. Comments from MENA also mentioned the volume of traffic levels on local streets as being inconsistent with the General Plan. MENA also suggested the Traffic Impact Study be analyzed with cumulative impacts as opposed to isolated studies.

An additional comment was received regarding access to the project site, stating the roads cannot accommodate construction traffic.

The Sacramento Zoological Society expressed concern for transportation improvements to the highway access at Sutter's Landing Parkway in addition to the proposed project.

Several comments were received expressing concerns regarding the lack of freeway access within the project area and requesting a Traffic Impact Study be prepared.

COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE 2013 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The NOP for this Draft EIR was released on May 24, 2013, and the public comment period closed on July 9, 2013. The City received a total of 474 letters, which included 316 form letters. Comment letters were received from nine public agencies including Caltrans, Sacramento County, Regional Transit, Sacramento County EMD, and the Sacramento–Yolo Mosquito Abatement District. A majority of the stated concerns related to the increase in traffic associated with the project, storm drainage and flooding issues, potential impacts to protected raptors and loss of foraging habitat, and safety of placing residents in close proximity to the freeway and the UPRR tracks.

A brief overview of the primary concerns raised in the NOP comment letters is included below. The purpose of the NOP process is to solicit input from public agencies and the

public on the scope of the EIR analysis. Opinions on the merits of the project are noted, but are not considered relevant for the purposes of defining the scope of the analysis. Due to the large number of comments received only the primary concerns that address the scope of the EIR and issues of importance that need to be addressed are summarized below. In addition, the Introduction of each technical section in Chapter 4 provides a brief summary of comments relevant to that particular issue area. All of the NOP comment letters received are included in Appendix A.

Land Use, Planning and Population

Comments related to land use, population, and housing include concerns that the project is too dense, does not include a mixed-use component, is not “smart growth,” is not consistent with Senate Bill (SB) 375, is incompatible with the adjacent light industrial uses to the south, and does not include any affordable units.

Air Quality and Climate Change

Many comments received on this subject expressed concerns associated with siting a residential project adjacent to a freeway and the UPRR tracks, where air quality has the potential to contain high-levels of toxins or particulate matter that can lead to negative health effects on future residents. Commenters requested preparation of an HRA and on-site monitoring of the project site to evaluate the potential health risks of the project. One comment suggested greater setbacks to reduce harmful health risks resulting from proximity to the freeway and railroad tracks. Information regarding mitigation measures to protect the surrounding community from construction emissions, particulate matter, dust, and dirt spillover was also received. Another comment suggested the cumulative analysis should consider other projects in the area including the Mercy Hospital and Sutter General Hospital expansion, as well as the proposed Sutter Memorial reuse project.

Biological Resources

Comments included concerns regarding displacement of wildlife in the area, loss of wildlife corridors, loss of trees and habitat for nesting birds, loss of foraging habitat, and general impacts to biological resources. Numerous comment letters raised concerns regarding the Swainson’s hawk and other raptors (including burrowing owl and white-tailed kite). Other wildlife issues include impacts to the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) and the potential for wetlands that might be present on the site.

Hazards and Public Safety

The primary concerns raised regarding hazards and public safety were associated with proximity to the former 28th Street Landfill and developing residences in close proximity to the freeway and the UPRR tracks. Potential derailment and hazards associated with an accidental

spill of hazardous materials were also raised, as well as ability to safely evacuate the site in the event of an emergency.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage

Comments were received regarding the potential exposure of the project site to flood hazards, and the potential effects of the project on off-site flood hazards. Specific areas of concern included effects of a catastrophic flood event or levee failure and the ability to safely evacuate the site; the potential effects of creating underpasses beneath the UPRR embankment, and the manner in which proposed flood gates would be operated; and the project's impacts to the City combined sewer and storm drain system. Concerns were also raised regarding localized flooding in the East Sacramento neighborhood and the potential for the project to increase off-site flooding.

Noise and Vibration

The primary concerns regarding noise were focused on placing residences in close proximity to the Capital City Freeway and the UPRR tracks, along with concerns associated with vibration from passing trains.

Public Services, Recreation and Public Utilities

Commenters expressed concern regarding the ability of the local elementary school (Theodore Judah) to handle an increase in students and the safety of school children in the area with an increase in traffic on local roadways. Comments were also raised asking if the A Street Bridge, 40th Street underpass, and the Alhambra Boulevard underpass would be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Safety of the proposed bicycle/pedestrian tunnel was also raised.

Transportation and Circulation

A majority of the comments received were concerned with the increase of traffic on local roadways. Generally, commenters expressed concern with extending 40th Street and requested that a vehicle access be provided at Alhambra Boulevard. Concerns about an increase in traffic crossing the railroad tracks at 28th/B Street were also raised. The potential closure of the E Street on ramp to the Capital City Freeway, widening of Capital City Freeway, an increase in frequency of trains along the UPRR corridor, and the desire to see traffic calming measures added as mitigation were also raised.

POTENTIAL ISSUES OF CONCERN

The primary issues of concern raised were associated with an increase in traffic on local roadways and at local intersections, including the at-grade train crossing at 28th/B Street. Other potential issues of concern include safety of residents in the event of a flood and adequate time

for evacuation, and close proximity of the project site to the freeway and UPRR tracks. Concerns associated with overcrowding at the local elementary school and loss of foraging habitat for protected raptor species are also potential issues of concern for the project.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where significant environmental impacts will not occur.

As is evident from the text of the EIR, all significant effects of the project would be mitigated to less than significant levels by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There are no impacts that remain as significant and unavoidable and which cannot be substantially lessened. The EIR evaluates the following alternatives to the proposed project:

No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative assumes that the proposed project would not be built and there would be no new development of the site. This alternative assumes the site would remain undeveloped.

No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative. This alternative assumes that the project site would be developed consistent with the underlying zoning of M-2. Under this alternative, the site would be developed with a railcar and locomotive and maintenance facility, based on preliminary plans prepared by Caltrans evaluating future sites for this type of use.

Lower Density Alternative. This alternative assumes development of a lower density project that includes 226 residential units with an average density of 7 dwelling units/acre (du/ac). This alternative includes a 2-acre park in the center of the site, but it would not include a recreation center or the other two smaller parks. The same circulation and site access would be provided as the proposed project with the exception of no bicycle/pedestrian underpass, if approved by UPRR.

Mixed Use/Higher Density Alternative. This alternative assumes development of 550 units with an average density of 18 du/ac. Similar to the proposed project, there would be a 2-acre park in the center of the site composed of a park and a recreational center (approximately 1-acre each). This alternative also provides an additional 1.2 acres in onsite parks. In addition, this alternative includes approximately 20,000 sf of commercial uses (located on approximately 1 acre). The same circulation and site access would be provided as the project, including the bicycle/pedestrian underpass, if approved by UPRR.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Information in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, has been organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4. The summary table is arranged in four columns and organized as follows:

1. Environmental impacts;
2. Level of significance prior to mitigation;
3. Applicable mitigation; and
4. The level of significance after implementation of mitigation.

This Draft EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including state laws and regulations, the City of Sacramento 2030 General Plan policies, and requirements or recommendations of the City of Sacramento and applicable building codes. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area in Chapter 4 and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 4, Introduction to the Analysis.

SOURCES CITED

City of Sacramento. 2009. *2030 General Plan Master EIR*. March 2009.

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2012. "Important Farmland Maps." Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Index.aspx>.

Harriman, S. 2013. A Street right-of-way. Phone call between S. Harriman (City of Sacramento Integrated Waste General Manager) and B. Hogge.

WKA (Wallace-Kuhl and Associates Inc.). 2006. *Geotechnical Engineering Report, The Village*. WKA No. 7244.06. September 6, 2006.

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>4.1 Air Quality and Climate Change</i>			
<p>4.1-1: The proposed project would result in short-term (construction) emissions of NO_x above 85 pounds per day.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>4.1-1(a) The following Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices shall be implemented to minimize NO_x emissions during all construction activities associated with the proposed project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project shall provide a plan for approval by the lead agency and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower [hp] or more) off-road vehicles to be used during construction, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, shall achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20% NO_x reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent California Air Resources Board (CARB) fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's Construction Mitigation Calculator shall be used to identify an equipment fleet that achieves this reduction. • The project representative shall submit to the lead agency and the Air District a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of project construction. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the Air District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The District's Model Equipment List can be used to submit this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40% opacity for more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40% opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately. Noncompliant equipment will be documented and a summary provided to the lead agency and Air District monthly. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The Air District and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other Air District, state, or federal rules or regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If at the time of construction, the Air District has adopted a regulation applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation may completely or partially replace this mitigation. Consultation with the Air District prior to construction shall be required to make this determination. <p>4.1-1(b) At the time grading permits are issued, the project applicant shall pay the SMAQMD off-site mitigation program fee, which shall be calculated based on the estimated amount of NO_x emissions that exceed 85 pounds per day during each day of project construction after onsite construction mitigation (both the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and the Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices) is applied. In consultation with the SMAQMD staff, and prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a construction mitigation fee and associated administrative fee shall be calculated and paid to the SMAQMD. Fees shall be calculated using the Carl Moyer cost effectiveness rate as determined at the time grading</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		permits are issued (currently \$17,460 per ton of NO _x) plus a 5% administrative fee, or the applicable fee amounts in effect at the time of permit/plan issuance.	
4.1-2: The proposed project could result in long-term (operational) emissions of NO _x or ROG above 65 pounds per day.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-3: The proposed project could violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in PM ₁₀ concentrations equal to or greater than 5% of the state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) during project construction.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1-4: The proposed project could result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-5: The proposed project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-6: The proposed project could result in increased exposure to TACs from mobile sources, potentially increasing the lifetime cancer risk of future residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1-7: The proposed project could impede the City or state efforts to meet AB 32 standards for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions or conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.1-8: The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>4.2 Biological Resources</i>			
<p>4.2-1: The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>Birds 4.2-1(a) Should construction activities begin during the breeding season (March 1 through September 15), a qualified biologist shall conduct appropriate pre-construction surveys for Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, purple martin, and other raptor and native bird nests within or immediately adjacent to the project site and all off-site improvement areas no more than 30 days before any construction activity commences. The pre-construction surveys shall be conducted between March and September and shall follow accepted survey protocols for these species. The purpose of the surveys will be to determine if active nests of special-status birds are present in the disturbance zone or within 500 feet of the disturbance zone boundary (and within 0.25 mile for Swainson’s hawks). If active nests are found, ground-disturbing activities within 300 feet of the nest (and up to 500 feet for most raptors, depending upon specific site conditions) shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the qualified biologist, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist. Limits of construction to avoid impacts to an active nest during construction activities shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers, and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. If active Swainson’s hawk nests are located within 0.25 mile of proposed construction activities, construction shall not begin, or shall be</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>discontinued, until the project applicant has consulted with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine the appropriate course of action, consistent with the guidance provided in the 1994 Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks in the Central Valley of California (CDFG 1994), to reduce potential impacts on nesting Swainson’s and to determine under what circumstances construction activities can occur. Possible measures to reduce potential impacts could include creation of buffers, limits on the timing or location of use of construction equipment, limits on the types of equipment used to reduce noise intensity, etc. Equipment operation and construction activities shall be suspended until CDFW provides direction. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed, then additional pre-disturbance surveys shall be conducted such that no more than 7 days elapse between the survey and ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities are to occur near active nest areas to avoid inadvertent impacts to these nests.</p> <p>Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat 4.2-1(b) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall provide the City with evidence that the applicant has compensated for the loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Compensation shall provide suitable foraging habitat and shall be consistent with guidance provided in the 1994 <i>Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks in the</i></p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p><i>Central Valley of California</i> (CDFG 1994). Suitable foraging habitat includes fallow land, alfalfa or other low growing crops, as defined in CDFG 1994 and Estep 1989.</p> <p>Consistent with the CDFG staff report, habitat shall be provided at the ratio of 1:1 (mitigation: impact). The habitat provided shall be of equal or greater quality than that lost as a result of the proposed project. A detailed description of the location and boundaries of the easements to be maintained and managed as Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat shall be provided by the project applicant. The project applicant shall coordinate with the City’s Environmental Services Department to ensure the land meets the City’s requirements as well as current California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) criteria.</p> <p>The project applicant shall record one or more conservation easements consistent with the above standards. The conservation easement(s) shall be executed by the project applicant and a conservation operator and shall satisfy the requirements of applicable state law. The conservation easement(s) shall be reviewed by CDFW prior to the recordation. The conservation easements shall prohibit planting or maintenance of vineyards or orchards.</p> <p>The project applicant shall also prepare a Swainson’s hawk habitat management and monitoring plan for submittal to the City for approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following: crops and/or habitat types that will be planted and managed on the parcel; rotation and harvest schedule if crops are planted; and</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>monitoring that will occur to ensure that the parcel is managed as Swainson’s hawk habitat and to report on the extent to which Swainson’s hawks are utilizing the parcel as foraging habitat.</p> <p>VELB 4.2-1(c) The project applicant shall implement avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures for VELB consistent with the Biological Opinion (June 2008) and Memorandum of Understanding (May 2008) with USFWS. These measures include the following: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training shall be conducted for all construction personnel by a USFWS-approved biologist prior to start of construction. WEAP shall include information on responsibilities regarding VELB, the life-history of the species, protections afforded under the FESA and potential penalties, and the protection measures identified in the Biological Opinion. A USFWS-approved biological monitor(s) shall inspect construction-related activities at the proposed site to ensure that no unauthorized take of federally listed VELB or destruction of their habitat occurs. The name(s) and resume(s) of the monitor(s) shall be submitted to USFWS 30 days prior to the start of construction. The monitor shall have the authority through communication with the resident engineer to stop all construction activities in the immediate area if a VELB is encountered during construction until appropriate corrective measures have been completed or until the VELB is</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>determined to be unharmed. VELB encountered during construction activities shall be allowed to move away from the area on their own volition. The monitor shall notify USFWS immediately if any listed species are found on site.</p> <p>Project construction within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs shall be prohibited during the beetle emergence and mating period (March 15 through June 15) to eliminate any indirect effects on the beetle or its eggs.</p> <p>Measures consistent with the current Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to minimize effects to the VELB during construction. BMPs shall be implemented to prevent sedimentation from entering environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) and to reduce erosion, dust, noise and other deleterious aspects of construction-related activities. These BMPs may include, but are not limited to, silt fencing, temporary berms, restrictions on cleaning equipment in or near ESAs, installation of vegetative strips, and temporary sediment disposal. Runoff from dust control and hazardous materials shall be retained on the construction site and prevented from flowing into the ESAs.</p> <p>Roadways and areas disturbed by project activities within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs shall be watered at least twice a day to minimize dust emissions.</p> <p>During construction operations, the number of access routes, number and size of staging areas, and the total area of the proposed project activity shall be limited to the minimum necessary. Routes and boundaries shall be clearly</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>demarcated. Movement of heavy equipment to and from the project site shall be restricted to established roadways to minimize habitat disturbance. Project-related vehicles shall observe a 20-miles-per-hour speed limit within construction areas, except on City and county roads and on state and federal highways. All heavy equipment, vehicles, and supplies shall be stored at the designated staging area at the end of each work period.</p> <p>During construction operations, stockpiling of construction materials, portable equipment, vehicles, and supplies shall be restricted to the designated construction staging areas and exclusive of the ESAs. The project applicant (or construction contractor) shall ensure contamination of habitat does not occur during such operations. All workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.</p> <p>No application of herbicides, insecticides, and/or other chemical agents shall occur within 100-feet of the elderberry plants or where they might drift or wash into the area of the elderberry plants.</p> <p>The project applicant shall require documentation from the contractor that aggregate, fill, or borrow material provided for the project was obtained in compliance with the Act.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of construction activities, high visibility fencing shall be erected around the VELB habitat to identify them and protect designated ESAs from encroachment of personnel and equipment. These areas shall be avoided by all construction personnel. The fencing shall be inspected before</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>each work day maintained by the project applicant until completion of the project. The fencing may be removed only when the construction of the project is complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing shall be established at a minimum setback of 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry shrub that is between 20 and 100 feet of the proposed project construction activity. These shrubs shall not be removed or transplanted. There shall be no physical alterations of any type within the area enclosed by the fencing. <p>Signs shall be posted every 50 feet along the edge of the ESA, with the following information: "This area is habitat of a federally threatened and/or endangered species, and must not be disturbed. These species are protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment." The signs shall be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet, and must be maintained for the duration of the construction.</p> <p>A post construction walk-through shall be conducted to assess whether any damage occurred to vegetation within the buffer areas. Damage may include accidental cutting of vegetation or visible physical damage to roots, stems, and leaves. If damage is observed, vegetation within the buffer areas shall be restored with appropriate native plant species. Erosion control measures and exotic weed abatement measures shall be implemented. If unanticipated damage is done to elderberry shrubs, USFWS shall be notified and appropriate compensation shall be implemented.</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>After construction activities are complete, any temporary fill or construction debris shall be removed and disturbed areas restored to their pre-project conditions. An area subject to “temporary” disturbance includes an area that is disturbed during the project, but that, after project completion, shall not be subject to further disturbance and has the potential to be re-vegetated.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project proponent shall compensate for the temporary and permanent loss of habitat of the VELB as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shrubs that cannot be preserved in place shall be transplanted to an area that will have minimal human use and where associated native riparian species are located or an alternative USFWS-approved mitigation site. • Elderberry shrubs shall be transplanted when the plant is dormant (November 1 through February 14) to increase the success of the transplanting, if feasible. A qualified biologist shall be available to monitor transplanting activity. • If transplantation is not feasible during the dormant period (i.e., because of timing constraints), the number of elderberry seedlings and associated native plants shall be increased to an appropriate amount, based on consultation with USFWS. • Each elderberry stem measuring 1 inch or greater in diameter at ground level that is adversely affected (i.e., 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation																												
		<p>transplanted or destroyed) shall be replaced with elderberry seedlings and seedlings of associated species, in accordance with the Conservation Guidelines. Elderberry seedlings or cutting shall be replaced at ratios ranging from 1:1 to 6:1 (see below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Associated native plants shall be planted at 1:1 or 2:1 ratios (see below). Stock of seedlings and/or cutting should be obtained from local sources. <p style="text-align: center;">Table 4.2-5 Approved Elderberry Mitigation Ratios</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="751 881 1707 1328"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stem Size</th> <th>Exit Holes?</th> <th>Elderberry Seedling Ratio</th> <th>Associated Native Plant Seedlings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 inch—3 inches</td> <td>No</td> <td>1:1</td> <td>1:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 inches—5 inches</td> <td>No</td> <td>2:1</td> <td>1:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>5 inches</td> <td>No</td> <td>3:1</td> <td>1:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 inch—3inches</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>2:1</td> <td>2:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 inches—5 inches</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>4:1</td> <td>2:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>5 inches</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>6:1</td> <td>2:1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Sources: Biological Opinion (USFWS 2008b) and Memorandum of Understanding (USFWS 2008a).</p>	Stem Size	Exit Holes?	Elderberry Seedling Ratio	Associated Native Plant Seedlings	1 inch—3 inches	No	1:1	1:1	3 inches—5 inches	No	2:1	1:1	>5 inches	No	3:1	1:1	1 inch—3inches	Yes	2:1	2:1	3 inches—5 inches	Yes	4:1	2:1	>5 inches	Yes	6:1	2:1	
Stem Size	Exit Holes?	Elderberry Seedling Ratio	Associated Native Plant Seedlings																												
1 inch—3 inches	No	1:1	1:1																												
3 inches—5 inches	No	2:1	1:1																												
>5 inches	No	3:1	1:1																												
1 inch—3inches	Yes	2:1	2:1																												
3 inches—5 inches	Yes	4:1	2:1																												
>5 inches	Yes	6:1	2:1																												

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Prior to ground-breaking activities at the project site, the project applicant shall purchase the required beetle habitat credits at a USFWS-approved conservation bank. Each credit purchased shall provide for the planting of five elderberry seedlings and five associated native plant seedlings. The project applicant proposed to purchase credits from Wildlands Inc., River Ranch Conservation Bank or another approved mitigation bank.	
4.2-2: The proposed project could interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.2-3: The proposed project could cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.2-4: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative loss of habitat for common and special-status wildlife species.	Potentially Significant	4.2-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b).	Less than Significant
<i>4.3 Cultural Resources</i>			
4.3-1: Project construction could disturb, damage or destroy unidentified subsurface archaeological or historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	Potentially Significant	4.3-1(a) If any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains are encountered during any construction activities, the Contractor shall implement measures deemed necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspend work within 100 feet of the find; and, • Immediately notify the City’s Community Development Director and coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist as needed to assess the resources (i.e., whether it is a “historical resource” or a “unique archaeological resource”); and, • Provide management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources could include resource avoidance or data recovery excavations, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout, or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects. 	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, the Contractor in consultation with the Preservation Director, State Historic Preservation Officer, and if applicable, Tribal representatives, may include preparation of reports for resources identified as potentially eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. <p>4.3-1(b) If a Native American site is discovered, the evaluation process required by Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) shall include consultation with the appropriate Native American representatives. If Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are discovered, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist, who is certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) and/or meets the federal standards as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR 61), and by Native American representatives, who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions.</p> <p>In the event that no such Native American representative is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. If historic archaeological sites are involved, all identified treatment (e.g., conduct additional archaeological surveys and provide measures to preserve the integrity or minimize damage or destruction of significant resources) is to be carried out by qualified historical archaeologists, who shall meet either Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) or 36 CFR 61 requirements.</p>	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		4.3-1(c) If a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during earth-moving activities, all work shall stop within 100 feet of the find, and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who shall notify the person most likely believed to be a descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the contractor to develop a program for re-internment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work is to take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have taken place.	
4.3-2: Project construction could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.3-3: Construction of off-site infrastructure could damage or destroy previously undiscovered prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources or human remains.	Potentially Significant	4.3-3 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) through 4.3-1(c).	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.3-4: Modifications to the A Street Bridge could disturb, damage, or destroy an unidentified historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.3-5: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative losses of historic and prehistoric resources in the greater Sacramento region.	Potentially Cumulatively Significant	4.3-5 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 (a) through (c).	Less than Significant
<i>4.4 Hazards and Public Safety</i>			
4.4-1: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities.	Less than Significant	4.4-1(a) In the event that grading or construction of the proposed project reveals evidence of soil contamination, underground storage tanks (USTs), or other environmental concerns, a Construction Management Plan shall be prepared. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified environmental professional registered in California. The plan shall identify specific measures to take to protect worker and public health and safety and specify measures to identify, manage, and remediate wastes. The plan shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accident prevention measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Summary of known site history and site 	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>concentrations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appropriate work practices necessary to effectively comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations, including, without limitation, hazardous substance management, handling, storage, disposal, and emergency response. These work practices include the following: an on-site hazardous material spill kit shall be provided for small spills; totally enclosed containment shall be provided for all trash; and all construction waste, including trash and litter, garbage, other solid waste, petroleum products, and other potentially hazardous materials, shall be removed to an appropriate waste facility permitted or otherwise authorized to treat, store, or dispose of such materials. ○ Instructions for marking/protecting the groundwater wellheads and gas probes so that they are protected from destruction during construction activities. ▪ Contamination evaluation and management procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of air monitoring procedures and parameters and/or physical observations (soil staining, odors, or buried 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		material) to be used to identify potential contamination. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for temporary cessation of construction activity and evaluation of the level of environmental concern if potential contamination is encountered. ○ Procedures for limiting access to the contaminated area to properly trained personnel. ○ Procedures for notification and reporting, including internal management and local agencies (fire department, SCEMD, etc.), as needed. ○ A worker health and safety plan for excavation of contaminated soil. ○ Procedures for characterizing and managing excavated soils in accordance with CCR Title 14 and Title 22. ○ Procedures for certification of completion of remediation. 	
4.4-2: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., residents, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>Asbestos/Construction Activities 4.4-2(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a).</p> <p>Former Landfill 4.4-2(b) New residents shall be notified in writing of the proximity to the former 28th Street Landfill, the existence of landfill gas, the</p>	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
hazardous materials or situations.		presence of a landfill gas collection system on the former 28th Street Landfill property, monthly landfill gas monitoring within and around the project site, details for how to obtain the landfill gas monitoring reports, and the potential for odors and other nuisances originated from activities on the former Landfill.	
4.4-3: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.4-4: The proposed project could substantially increase the risk of exposure of site occupants to inadvertent or accidental releases of hazardous substances transported on adjacent roadways or rail lines near the site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.4-5: The proposed project could impair implementation of or physically interfere with	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.			
4.4-6: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in the potential exposure of people to sites where soil and/or groundwater contamination could be present from past or current uses.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<i>4.5 Hydrology, Water Quality and Drainage</i>			
4.5-1: Construction activities associated with the project could generate increases in sediment and/or other contaminants which could violate water quality objectives and/or waste discharge requirements set by the State Water Resources Control Board.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.5-2: The design of the project, including increases in impervious surface area and residential uses on site could result in substantial long-term effects on water quality.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.5-3: Use of the combined sewer system could increase the likelihood of overflows during peak wet weather flows.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.5-4: Residential development could increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of loss, injury, damage, or death in the event of a levee breach along the American River or failure of Folsom Dam.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.5-5: Plans to create vehicular and bicycle/pedestrian underpasses through the Union Pacific Railroad embankment could expose areas of East Sacramento to additional flood hazards.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.5-6: Stormwater runoff within the proposed development could exceed the capacity of on-site and/or off-site drainage facilities, including detention basins, storm drains, and/or pump stations, resulting in excessive ponding, nuisance flooding, or degradation of water quality on or off site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.5-7: The proposed project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.5-8: The proposed project, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in the generation of polluted runoff that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for receiving waters.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.5-9: The proposed project, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in increased numbers of residents and structures exposed to a regional 100-year flood event.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>4.6 Noise and Vibration</i>			
4.6-1: Short-term project construction could exceed the City's Noise Ordinance.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.6-2: Project construction could expose existing or planned residential areas to vibration greater than 0.5 inches per second.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.6-3: The proposed project could permanently increase ambient exterior noise levels in the project vicinity (off site) that exceed city standards.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.6.4: Noise from the adjacent UPRR tracks could result in interior noise levels at the project that exceed the City's 45 dBA L _{dn} standard.	Potentially Significant	4.6-4(a) All windows visible to trains shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) Rating of 35. All other windows (bedroom or otherwise) from which the trains would NOT be visible shall have a STC rating of at least 30. 4.6-4(b) Exterior doors facing the railroad tracks shall be solid core with a minimum rated STC value of 35.	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>4.6-4(c) Exterior wall construction for the walls facing the railroad tracks shall consist of 2- x 6-inch studs with insulation completely filling the stud cavity, stucco exterior, and two layers of 5/8-inch thick gypsum board on the interior surfaces.</p> <p>4.6-4(d) Mechanical ventilation shall be provided to allow occupants to close doors and windows as desired to achieve acoustical isolation as desired.</p> <p>4.6-4 (e) Roof materials shall be concrete tile or heavy-duty shingles such as the CertainTeed Presidential Series (or acoustic equivalent).</p> <p>4.6-4(f) Disclosure statements shall be provided to all prospective residences, as well as recorded against the land, notifying of the presence of the UPRR tracks and the accompanying elevated noise environment associated with existing and projected increased future rail activity.</p>	
<p>4.6.5: Noise from the adjacent Capital City Freeway could result in interior noise levels at the project that exceed the City's 45 dBA L_{dn} standard.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>4.6-5(a) All windows visible to Capital City Freeway (not just bedroom windows) shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) Rating of 35. All other windows shall have a minimum STC Rating of 30.</p> <p>4.6-5(b) Exterior wall construction shall consist of insulation in the stud cavity, stucco exterior, and 5/8-inch thick gypsum board on the interior surfaces.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		4.6-5(c) All exterior doors and windows shall be fully weather-stripped. 4.6-5(d) Mechanical ventilation shall be provided to allow occupants to close doors and windows as desired to achieve acoustical isolation as desired. 4.6-5(e) Disclosure statements shall be provided to all prospective residences, as well as recorded with the deed, notifying of the presence of the highway and the accompanying elevated noise environment associated with existing and projected increased traffic on Capital City Freeway.	
4.6-6: The proposed project could expose on-site residential areas to vibration greater than 0.5 inch per second due to adjacent highway traffic and rail operations.	Less than Significant	4.6-6 Disclosure statements shall be provided to prospective homebuyers for homes located adjacent to the UPRR right-of-way, informing them of the presence of the UPRR tracks and that vibration may be periodically perceptible during train pass bys.	Less than Significant
4.6-7: Increase in cumulative noise generated by future passenger and freight train operations could expose project residents closest to the UPRR tracks to increased noise	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
and exceed City standards.			
4.6-8: Increase in cumulative traffic noise at the exterior of residences proposed adjacent to Capital City Freeway could expose project residents to increased noise and exceed city standards.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.6-9: Cumulative exposure of project residents to traffic and train noise could expose project residents to increased noise that exceeds City standards.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<i>4.7 Public Services and Recreation</i>			
4.7-1: The proposed project could increase demand for police services requiring the need to construct new facilities, or expand existing facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.7-2: The proposed project could increase demand for fire protection services requiring the need to construct new facilities, or expand existing facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7-3: The proposed project could generate an increase in students that would exceed the design capacity of existing or planned schools that would serve the site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7-4: The proposed project could cause or accelerate the physical deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities or create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
anticipated in the General and/or Community Plans.			
4.7-5: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for police services and facilities that could result in the need for new or physically altered facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7-6: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for fire protection services and facilities that could result in the need for new or physically altered facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.7-7: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in students that could exceed the design	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
capacity of existing or planned schools that would serve the site.			
4.7-8: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for parks and recreation facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<i>4.8 Public Utilities</i>			
4.8-1: The proposed project could result in an increased demand for potable water in excess of existing supplies.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-2: The proposed project could result in inadequate capacity in the City's water supply facilities to meet demand requiring the construction of new water supply facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-3: The proposed project could exceed existing wastewater capacity to serve the	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
project's demand in addition to existing commitments.			
4.8-4: The proposed project could require or result in either the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-5: The proposed project could require the expansion or construction of new solid waste facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-6: Operation of the proposed project could require or result in the	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.			
4.8-7: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for water supply in excess of existing supplies.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-8: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in the demand for water and wastewater treatment, which could result in inadequate capacity and require the construction of new facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.8-9: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in storm water runoff which could result in either the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.8-10: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in solid waste, which could result in either the construction of new solid waste facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.8-11: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in energy demand, which could result in the need for construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<i>4.9 Transportation and Circulation</i>			
4.9-1: The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to study intersections.	Significant	4.9-1 The project applicant shall pay the City of Sacramento Traffic Operations Center to monitor and re-time the H Street/ Alhambra Boulevard traffic signal to optimize traffic flow through the intersection.	Less than Significant
4.9-2: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to transit.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-3: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to pedestrian facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-4: Project buildout could cause potentially	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
significant impacts to bicycle facilities.			
4.9-5: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts due to construction-related activities.	Significant	4.9-5 Prior to the beginning of construction, the applicant shall prepare a construction traffic and parking management plan to the satisfaction of City Traffic Engineer and subject to review by all affected agencies. The plan shall ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained. At a minimum, the plan shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of trucks including: number and size of trucks per day, expected arrival/departure times, truck circulation patterns. • Description of staging area including: location, maximum number of trucks simultaneously permitted in staging area, use of traffic control personnel, specific signage. • Description of street closures and/or bicycle and pedestrian facility closures including: duration, advance warning and posted signage, safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles, and use of manual traffic control. • Description of driveway access plan including: provisions for safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, minimum distance from any open trench, special signage, and private vehicle accesses. 	Less than Significant
4.9-6: The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to study	Significant	4.9-6(a) The project applicant shall contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento Traffic Operations Center to monitor and re-time the H Street/Alhambra Boulevard, H Street/30th Street, and H Street 29th Street traffic signals to optimize flow through the	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
intersections under cumulative plus project conditions.		<p>corridor, and to implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Restripe the westbound approach to the H Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersection to have one shared through/right lane and one shared through/left lane. ○ Remove on-street parking on the north side of H Street between 30th Street and Alhambra Boulevard to accommodate two westbound travel lanes. ○ Prohibit on-street parking during peak periods (7-9 AM and 4-6 PM) on the south side of H Street to allow for two eastbound lanes between 30th Street and Alhambra Boulevard while maintaining the same lane configurations on the eastbound approach to the H Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersection. <p>4.9-6(b) The project applicant shall contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento Traffic Operations Center to monitor and re-time the E Street/Alhambra Boulevard traffic signal to optimize flow, and to implement the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remove the bulb-out on the southbound approach to the E Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersection and prohibit on-street parking on the west side of Alhambra Boulevard during peak periods (7-9 AM and 4-6 PM) to allow for the installation of a dedicated southbound right-turn lane. ○ Restripe the northbound approach to the E Street/Alhambra Boulevard intersection to include a 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		northbound dedicated right-turn lane. 4.9-6(c) The project applicant shall contribute its fair share toward the installation of a traffic signal at the McKinley Boulevard/33rd Street intersection.	
4.9-7: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to transit.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-8: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to pedestrian facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-9: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to bicycle facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.9-10: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts due to construction-related activities.	Significant	4.9-10 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-5.	Less than Significant
<i>4.10 Urban Design and Visual Resources</i>			
4.10-1: The proposed project could degrade	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.			
4.10-2: The proposed project could create a new source of light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10-3: The proposed project could contribute to long-term impacts to the visual character of the region in combination with existing and future development in the City of Sacramento.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
4.10-4: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in light and glare.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
<p>Notes: LS = impacts less than significant NI = No impact LS/M = Impacts less than significant after mitigation PS = Potentially significant (mitigation not determined) SU = Impacts significant and unavoidable SU/M = Impacts significant even with mitigation "+" indicates the impact is more severe than the project impact "-" indicates that the impact is less severe than the project impact (1) The impact to off-site receptors is potentially cumulatively significant. Direct project impact is less than significant.</p>					
<i>Air Quality</i>					
4.1-1: The proposed project would result in short-term (construction) emissions of NO _x above 85 pounds per day.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.1-2: The proposed project could result in long-term (operational) emissions of NO _x or ROG above 65 pounds per day.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS/M+
4.1-3: The proposed project could violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in PM ₁₀ concentrations equal to or greater than 5% of the state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) during project construction.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS/M+
4.1-4: The proposed project could result in CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm).	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS+
4.1-5: The proposed project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS
4.1-6: The proposed project could result in increased exposure to TACs from mobile sources, potentially increasing the lifetime cancer risk of future residents.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.1-7: The proposed project could impede the City or state efforts to meet AB 32 standards for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions or conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.1-8: The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+
<i>Biological Resources</i>					
4.2-1: The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.2-2: The proposed project could interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-3: The proposed project could cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-4: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative loss of habitat for common and special-status wildlife species.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
<i>Cultural Resources</i>					
4.3-1: Project construction could disturb, damage, or destroy unidentified subsurface archaeological or historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.3-2: Project construction could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.3-3: Construction of off-site infrastructure could damage or destroy previously undiscovered prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources or human remains.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.3-4: Modifications to the A Street Bridge could disturb, damage, or destroy an unidentified historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.3-5: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative losses of historic and prehistoric resources in the greater Sacramento region.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>					
4.4-1: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.4-2: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., residents, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials or other hazardous materials or situations.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.4-3: The proposed project could expose people (e.g., construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during dewatering activities.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.4-4: The proposed project could substantially increase the risk of exposure of site occupants to inadvertent or accidental releases of hazardous substances transported on adjacent roadways or rail lines near the site.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS
4.4-5: The proposed project could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.4-6: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in the potential exposure of people to sites where soil and/or groundwater contamination could be present from past or current uses.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>					
4.5-1: Construction activities associated with the project could generate increases in sediment and/or other contaminants which could violate water quality objectives and/or waste discharge requirements set by the State Water Resources Control Board.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-2: The design of the project, including increases in impervious surface area and residential uses on site could result in substantial long-term effects on water quality.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS
4.5-3: Use of the combined sewer system could increase the likelihood of overflows during peak wet weather flows.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-4: Residential development could increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of loss, injury, damage, or death in the event of a levee breach along the American River or failure of Folsom Dam.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-5: Plans to create vehicular and bicycle/pedestrian underpasses through the Union Pacific Railroad embankment could expose areas of East Sacramento to additional flood hazards.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-6: Stormwater runoff within the proposed development could exceed the capacity of on-site and/or off-site drainage facilities, including detention basins, storm drains, and/or pump stations, resulting in excessive ponding, nuisance flooding, or degradation of water quality on or off site.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.5-7: The proposed project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-8: The proposed project, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in the generation of polluted runoff that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for receiving waters.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS
4.5-9: The proposed project, in addition to other projects in the watershed, could result in increased numbers of residents and structures exposed to a regional 100-year flood event.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
<i>Noise</i>					
4.6-1: Short-term project construction could exceed the City's Noise Ordinance.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-2: Project construction could expose existing or planned residential areas to vibration greater than 0.5 inches per second.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-3: The proposed project could permanently increase ambient exterior noise levels in the project vicinity (off site) that exceed city standards.	LS	NI	PS(1)	LS-	LS+
4.6-4: Noise from the adjacent UPRR tracks could result in interior noise levels at the project that exceed the City's 45 dBA L _{dn} standard.	LS/M	NI	NI	LS+/M	LS/M
4.6-5: Noise from the adjacent Capital City Freeway could result in interior noise levels at the project that exceed the City's 45 dBA L _{dn} standard.	LS/M	NI	NI	LS+/M	LS/M
4.6-6: The proposed project could expose on-site residential areas to vibration greater than 0.5 inch per second due to adjacent highway traffic and rail operations.	LS	NI	NI	LS+	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.6-7: Increase in cumulative noise generated by future passenger and freight train operations could expose project residents closest to the UPRR tracks to increased noise and exceed City standards.	LS	NI	NI	LS	LS
4.6-8: Increase in cumulative traffic noise at the exterior of residences proposed adjacent to Capital City Freeway could expose project residents to increased noise and exceed City standards.	LS	NI	NI	LS	LS
4.6-9: Cumulative exposure of project residents to traffic and train noise could expose project residents to increased noise that exceeds City standards.	LS	NI	NI	LS	LS
<i>Public Services</i>					
4.7-1: The proposed project could increase demand for police services requiring the need to construct new facilities, or expand existing facilities.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS+
4.7-2: The proposed project could increase demand for fire protection services requiring the need to construct new facilities, or expand existing facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+
4.7-3: The proposed project could generate an increase in students that would exceed the design capacity of existing or planned schools that would serve the site.	LS	NI	NI	LS-	LS+
4.7-4: The proposed project could cause or accelerate the physical deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities or create a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the General and/or Community Plans.	LS	NI	NI	LS	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.7-5: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for police services and facilities that could result in the need for new or physically altered facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS
4.7-6: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for fire protection services and facilities that could result in the need for new or physically altered facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.7-7: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in students that could exceed the design capacity of existing or planned schools that would serve the site	LS	NI	NI	LS-	LS+
4.7-8: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for parks and recreation facilities.	LS	NI	NI	LS	LS
<i>Public Utilities</i>					
4.8-1: The proposed project could result in an increased demand for potable water in excess of existing supplies.	LS	NI	LS+	LS-	LS+
4.8-2: The proposed project could result in inadequate capacity in the City's water supply facilities to meet demand requiring the construction of new water supply facilities.	LS	NI	LS+	LS-	LS+
4.8-3: The proposed project could exceed existing wastewater capacity to serve the project's demand in addition to existing commitments.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS+
4.8-4: The proposed project could require or result in either the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.8-5: The proposed project could require the expansion or construction of new solid waste facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS+
4.8-6: Operation of the proposed project could result require or result in the construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+
4.8-7: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in demand for water supply in excess of existing supplies.	LS	NI	LS+	LS-	LS+
4.8-8: The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in the demand for water and wastewater treatment, which could result in inadequate capacity and require the construction of new facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+
4.8-9: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in storm water runoff which could result in either the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.8-10: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in solid waste, which could result in either the construction of new solid waste facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS+
4.8-11: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in energy demand, which could result in the need for construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	LS	NI	LS	LS-	LS+

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
<i>Transportation and Circulation</i>					
4.9-1: The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to study intersections.	LS/M	NI	LS-M	LS-/M	LS+/M
4.9-2: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to transit.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.9-3: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to pedestrian facilities.	LS	NI	LS+	LS+	LS
4.9-4: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to bicycle facilities.	LS	NI	LS+	LS+	LS
4.9-5: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts due to construction-related activities.	LS/M	NI	LS/M	LS/M	LS/M
4.9-6: The proposed project could cause potentially significant impacts to study intersections under cumulative plus project conditions.	LS/M	NI	LS-/M	LS-/M	LS+/M
4.9-7: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to transit (cumulative).	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.9-8: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to pedestrian facilities (cumulative).	LS	NI	LS+	LS+	LS
4.9-9: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts to bicycle facilities (cumulative).	LS	NI	LS+	LS+	LS
4.9-10: Project buildout could cause potentially significant impacts due to construction-related activities (cumulative)	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
<i>Urban Design and Visual Resources</i>					
4.10-1: The proposed project could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	LS	NI	LS+	LS	LS
4.10-2: The proposed project could create a new source of light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	NI	LS/M	LS	LS

**Table 2-2
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development	Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 3: Lower Density	Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use
4.10-3: The proposed project could contribute to long-term impacts to the visual character of the region in combination with existing and future development in the City of Sacramento.	LS	NI	LS+	LS	LS
4.10-4: The proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in light and glare.	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK