

## **2 SUMMARY**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This summary provides an overview of the Greenbriar project, which is described in detail in Chapter 3, “Project Description.” This summary also identifies the alternatives to the project, which are described in detail in Chapter 4, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project.” Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter, summarizes the environmental impacts identified for the project in each of the environmental issue sections of this draft environmental impact report (DEIR) (Chapter 6, “Environmental Analysis”). The table consists of environmental impacts, the significance without mitigation, proposed mitigation measure(s), and the significance of the impact if the mitigation measures are implemented.

This summary also provides a description of those areas of the document that are of most concern to LAFCo. This description is provided in Section 2.4, “Summary of LAFCo Issues of Concern.”

### **2.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The 577-acre project site is located in unincorporated Sacramento County, just west of the City of Sacramento. The site is immediately north of Interstate 5 (I-5) and west of State Route 70 and 99 (SR 70/99). The site is adjacent to existing agricultural uses to the north and west and residential land uses to the east and south, which are part of the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) area. Land to the west of the project site has been approved by Sacramento County for commercial and industrial development as part of the Metro Airpark Development (MAP) project. The project site primarily consists of undeveloped, agricultural land that has been historically rotated between rice, alfalfa, wheat, and row crops. A portion of the site supports remnants of former agricultural buildings and a former racetrack for horses.

The project would result in the development of a total 3,473 residential units: 671 low-density, 2,215 medium-density; and 587 high-density residential units, approximately 27.5 (net) acres of commercial land uses, an approximate 39-acre (net) lake/detention basin, a 10-acre (net) elementary school, approximately 49 (net) acres of parks and open space, and a 250-foot linear open space/buffer along the property’s western boundary that would be managed as habitat for the giant garter snake. Chapter 3, “Project Description” provides a more detailed description of the project.

### **2.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Project alternatives are intended to be developed to reduce or eliminate the potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project while attempting to meet the project objectives. An EIR is required to contain a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]).

The following sections summarize the alternatives to the Greenbriar project that are addressed in this DEIR. Chapter 4, “Alternatives to the Project” provides a more detailed description of these alternatives as well as other alternatives that were considered but rejected for reasons of infeasibility.

#### **2.3.1 OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVE**

In many EIRs, an off-site alternative is evaluated to provide a greater range of possible alternatives to consider in the decision-making process. The key question is whether an off-site alternative is available that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, and would also avoid or substantially lessen any of the environmental effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a]). The basic objectives of the

Greenbriar project include creating a residential development located near downtown Sacramento and Metro Air Park, as well as creating a single-family residential neighborhood that meets the growth principles established by the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Blueprint plan. In addition, the Greenbriar project would provide light rail transit opportunities on-site. The project site is located immediately adjacent to the North Natomas community and the project would be located in the NNCP area with a boundary line adjustment. The project would be a special planning area (SPA) and would implement its own planned unit development (PUD) guidelines.

Development in the North Natomas area has occurred fairly rapidly since adoption of the NNCP in 1994 and of the properties that are currently designated for residential land uses, there is not a known site that could accommodate a development similar to the Greenbriar project (in size) that is not already being pursued for development by other property owners. Further, there are not sufficient properties available that when combined could provide sufficient area for the proposed land uses. Areas that are currently being actively pursued by other developers include the area to the south of the project site, the Panhandle area (in the eastern portion of North Natomas, north and south of Del Paso Road), the area just west of Natomas Crossing, and the area to the southeast of the junction of State Route 70/99 (SR 70/99) and Elkhorn Boulevard. These vacant properties are either currently under City review for development, or homebuilders (other than the Greenbriar property owner) are actively assembling land in anticipation of submitting a development application.

None of the undeveloped residential properties within the NNCP area are currently owned by the Greenbriar property owner. Although it may be possible for the applicant to acquire a property of a similar size or acquire an aggregate of properties that could accommodate the proposed land use within the North Natomas area, given the timing of the application and the status of development in the North Natomas area, it is not reasonable to consider that the applicant would be successful in obtaining such a property. Further, while other property may be available outside the City limits, it would be more distant from the City and would "leapfrog" undeveloped area, leading to undesirable land use patterns and substantial growth inducement potential and it likely would not be located along the Downtown-Natomas-Airport lightrail line. For this reason, a specific off-site alternative has not been selected for analysis. However, to consider the relative environmental impacts of an alternative in one of the undeveloped areas of the NNCP currently designated for residential development, Chapter 8, "Comparative Merits of the Alternatives," provides a comparative analysis of this off-site alternative. Through this analysis, this DEIR considers whether an off-site alternative would reduce or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts identified in Chapter 6, "Environmental Analysis."

### **2.3.2 DISPERSED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

Among the findings to be considered in deliberations over the project, LAFCo will need to determine whether expansion of the City's SOI will be needed to provide adequate housing within its jurisdiction to meet projected housing demands. There are several properties designated for residential land uses within the City that are either undeveloped or under utilized such that they could be developed (or re-developed) with new residential land uses that could help the City meet its long-term housing demands.

According to the City's General Plan, as of September 2005 there were approximately 14,000 acres of low and medium density parcels of vacant land available. However, this number is likely less than this total, because there continues to be urban development in the North Natomas area, where the majority of this land is concentrated. For example, projects considered in a cumulative context include the Westborough, Cambay West, Natomas Crossing, Natomas Town Center, Natomas Creek and Panhandle projects (Exhibit 6-1), each of which are in the North Natomas area. In the south Sacramento area, SunCal Companies has announced they intend to develop on one of the last remaining large blocks of land in the City, the 800-acre Delta Shores site (SunCal press announcement, November 8, 2005). Vacant industrial sites at the downtown Sacramento and Curtis Park railyards are being actively pursued for development, with applications submitted on both. As this shows, the North Natomas area continues to be actively developed, and other large, vacant, or undeveloped parcels are being actively pursued. Further, much of the land is tied up by other landowners interested in development. None of the undeveloped low

or medium density residential or residential /mixed-use properties within the NNCP area or in other large, undeveloped areas of the City are currently owned by the Greenbriar property owner.

The purpose of this alternative is to consider whether existing properties within the City’s SOI could support the project’s proposed land uses, while at the same eliminating some of the project’s significant and significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. As described above, sufficient holding capacity is available within the City’s SOI to accommodate the project’s proposed residential development. In spite of the fact that the City may currently have holding capacity for the project, this is not expected to be the case in the foreseeable future. According to Sacramento City staff (McDonald, pers. comm., June 19, 2006), the Technical Background report for the City of Sacramento General Plan Update shows the following:

Current (2005) population:	450,000
Proposed General Plan Holding Capacity (2030):	564,000
Anticipated City population (2030):	650,000

Over the next 25 years, the City is expected to grow by 200,000 people. However, the current General Plan, including the current SOI, would accommodate an additional estimated 114,000 people. Additional land would be needed if the City intends to accommodate the 86,000 people above the General Plan’s holding capacity that are anticipated to live in the City.

The proposed project would also provide for employment through commercial/retail uses, although these uses would primarily serve residential uses on and near the project site. Projections for employment uses in the City are as follows:

Current (2005) employment:	181,000
Proposed General Plan Holding Capacity (2030):	445,000
Anticipated City employment (2030):	321,000

Unlike housing, the City has ample holding capacity for employment uses. As mentioned above, commercial/retail uses on the project site are intended to be local serving, and they would reduce the need for driving trips outside the project site. So, while they could be provided elsewhere within the City, they would frustrate project objectives for a mixed use development.

### **2.3.3 No PROJECT ALTERNATIVE (NP) – CONTINUATION OF EXISTING LAND USES**

Under the No Project Alternative (NP), development would not occur and the project site would remain designated for agricultural use. Production of agricultural crops (e.g., rice, wheat) would continue at the project site and no new facilities would be constructed. The project site would not be annexed into the City of Sacramento; and it would remain in the unincorporated area of the County of Sacramento. The project site’s current General Plan land use and zoning designations identified by the County of Sacramento would remain in effect. The Sacramento County General Plan designates the site for Agriculture, and it is zoned by the Sacramento County Zoning Code as Agricultural (AG 80). The no project alternative would be consistent with the designated land uses for the project site but would not meet the project objectives.

### **2.3.4 REDUCED SIZE ALTERNATIVE**

The Reduced Size Alternative is designed to reduce the development footprint of the project to avoid one or more of the project’s significant and significant and unavoidable impacts. The project would result in significant impacts in the areas of conversion of prime farmland and open space resources, visual character of the project site, transportation impacts on local roadways and intersections, operational air emissions, biological habitat and species, aircraft hazards, and noise. This alternative would constrain development at the project site to a development level that may be financially infeasible to implement but would achieve most if not all of the

project's objectives including providing sufficient development densities to support a light rail station and would continue to be consistent with SACOGS's Blueprint. Development of this alternative would be approximately 80% of proposed project levels (20% reduction in proposed development at the site). Therefore, this alternative would result in the development of 2,995 residential units and approximately 25 acres of commercial development. The remainder of the site would be undeveloped and would continue in its existing state. To reduce potential impacts to agricultural resources, sensitive biological species and habitats, and to minimize the development area that falls within the Sacramento International Airport's safety zone, development of this alternative would need to be concentrated in the eastern portion of the project site. However, mobile source air emissions and noise impacts from I-5 and SR 70/99 result in the need to locate sensitive receptors including the elementary school at a greater distance from these sources. Therefore, this alternative would need to be designed in such a way as to provide a buffer on the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. In general, this alternative would consist of a development project that would concentrate land uses in the north central portion of the site. An approximate 200–400 foot-wide buffer/open space/fallowed land area would be provided on the western, eastern, and southern boundaries of the project site (Exhibit 4-1).

### **2.3.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative among the alternatives considered be selected and the reasons for such selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts. In the case of the project, the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would not create any new site-specific adverse environmental impacts. However, CEQA requires the identification of another environmentally superior alternative when the “no project” alternative is identified as environmentally superior (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[e][2]).

The reduced size alternative would be environmentally superior to the project because it would substantially reduce the project's traffic, air, noise, farmland, and biological resources impacts. Further, it would meet most project objectives including supporting light rail and creating a development consistent with SACOG's Blueprint.

An off-site alternative within the existing boundaries of the NNCP would be environmentally superior to the project and to the reduced size alternative. This alternative is the overall superior alternative because it would avoid the project's significant aircraft safety hazard impact associated with compatibility with CLUP standards and it would substantially reduce traffic, farmland, biological, air quality, and noise impacts. Further, it would meet most if not all project objectives. However, a site within the NNCP is not currently owned by the project applicant and all land in the NNCP area is currently proposed for development. Therefore, it is not known whether the off-site alternative considered in this analysis is feasible. Further, this alternative would not meet the key project objective of providing development along the DNA line.

The dispersed development alternative would be environmentally superior to the project. While the project would avoid the project's significant aircraft safety hazard impact associated with compatibility with CLUP standards and it would substantially reduce traffic, farmland, biological, air quality, and noise impacts, depending on localized conditions, it could result in greater transportation impacts compared to the project. Further, multiple sites within the city limits or SOI are not currently owned by the project applicant and most land in the NNCP area and other areas of the City are currently proposed for development. Therefore, it is not known whether this theoretical off-site alternative considered in this analysis is feasible. Further, development of an alternative in a dispersed nature would not achieve key project objectives related to providing residential development that would support development of a light rail station along the DNA line.

## **2.4 SUMMARY OF LAFCo ISSUES OF INTEREST AND LEVEL OF IMPACT**

LAFCo is a co-lead agency for the project and is responsible as lead agency for considering the proposed City of Sacramento Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) for the project site, the SOIA for Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD), and LAFCo is responsible as a responsible agency for considering the

reorganization (annexation to the City of Sacramento and related detachments) of the project. LAFCo is the agency charged by the State Legislature through the Cortese-Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act (Act) of 2000 (Government Code Section 5600, et. seq.) with ensuring the timely and orderly formation of local government agencies and boundaries, to preserve prime agricultural and open space resources, and to discourage urban sprawl. Pursuant to the Act, LAFCo is responsible for reviewing logical and timely changes in local government boundaries, including reorganizations such as the proposed Greenbriar annexation. One essential element of the Act that provides for orderly growth is the annexation of land within an adopted SOI. The SOI is a policy tool used to provide guidance for consideration of annexation proposals and is intended to encourage efficient provision of municipal services and discourage duplication of service delivery. Land must be within a city's SOI to be annexed. The project site is located adjacent to the City of Sacramento's SOI on the south and east and the project applicant is requesting an amendment of the City's SOI to incorporate the project site. The SOI expansion and annexation request would be considered by LAFCo in a 2-step process: first, consideration of the SOIA amendment; second, if the SOIA is approved, consideration of reorganization for the project.

As a co-lead agency under CEQA, LAFCo must ensure that the environmental document prepared for the project adequately addresses LAFCo matters in addition to addressing City of Sacramento matters. As such, the following discussion briefly describes issues that are of primary importance to LAFCo and where detailed discussions of these issues can be found within this DEIR. The following issues are of primary interest to LAFCo:

- ▶ Utilities (Section 6.5): Issues related to the project's impacts to local and regional water and wastewater treatment and conveyance, storm drainage, and electrical and natural gas facilities are discussed in this section.
- ▶ Public Services (Section 6.6): Issues related to the project's impacts to police, fire, emergency, solid waste, school, and library services within the City are discussed in this section. Appendix K presents the City's Water Supply Assessment for the Greenbriar project.
- ▶ Parks and Open Space (Section 6.7): Issues related to the project's provision and preservation of park and open space areas including the project's impacts to existing City and County park and open space resources are discussed in this section.
- ▶ Agriculture (Section 6.12): Issues related to the project's impacts to existing agricultural resources, Williamson Act contracts, and adjacent agricultural operations are discussed in this section.
- ▶ Alternatives (Chapter 8): Issues related to its SOI amendment to accommodate projected residential development are evaluated in this section.

## 2.5 SUMMARY OF KNOWN CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

The CEQA Guidelines require that the summary of an EIR include a synopsis of known issues of controversy that have been raised by agencies and the public (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123). A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Greenbriar project was first released on June 28, 2005. In August 2005, Sacramento LAFCo and the City initiated a Memorandum of Understanding agreeing to act as co-lead agencies for CEQA review. The City re-circulated the NOP to indicate that LAFCo would be a co-Lead Agency for the project on August 16, 2005. An agency and public scoping session was held on July 13, 2005 to receive oral comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The following is a summary of the most controversial issues that were received during the NOP comment periods:

- ▶ loss of open space/prime farmland/habitat;
- ▶ suitability of proposed recreation facilities;
- ▶ construction and operational air quality;

- ▶ endangered species issues;
- ▶ noise and hazards from airport operations;
- ▶ traffic operations along I-5, SR 70/99, and local roadways; and
- ▶ loss of on-site wetlands.

A copy of the NOPs and a complete listing of the letters received during the comment periods including a transcript from the public scoping meeting are provided in Appendix A.

## 2.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

One issue to be resolved surrounding the project is whether the project site is an appropriate site for urban expansion. Because the property is not currently within the City’s SOI or city limits, several agencies (e.g., City of Sacramento and LAFCo) would need to make the findings that support urban expansion to this site.

A second issue to be resolved is the determination of the specific permit requirements that would be imposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) including preparation of a habitat conservation plan (HCP). This issue can only be resolved subsequent to the initiation of the Section 404 permit process and submittal of a draft HCP to the USFWS, which would occur with the submission of a permit application to the permitting agencies. The project applicant has submitted a 404 permit application and biological assessment to the USACE and will initiate consultation with USFWS.

A third issue to be resolved is consideration of the appropriate mix of land uses for the Greenbriar site. The respective adopted City and County of Sacramento general plans envision agriculture land uses for the project site. Both jurisdictions are currently undertaking general plan updates. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) recently prepared the Blueprint which presents a vision for future development of land uses in the six-county Sacramento region. The Blueprint envisions development of higher density mixed residential land uses on the Greenbriar site and areas north of the project site. The Greenbriar project has been designed to be consistent with the Smart Growth Principles outlined in SACOG’s adopted Blueprint, as well as those adopted by the City. Before adoption of SACOG’s Blueprint, the City and County of Sacramento entered into a Natomas Joint Vision Memorandum of Understanding which defines a set of guiding principles for future development in the unincorporated Natomas area. The Blueprint is consistent with the guiding principles adopted by the City and County. The project site is located within the Natomas Joint Vision (Joint Vision) area and land uses identified for the project site are consistent with the general land uses proposed by SACOG’s Blueprint.

A fourth issue to be resolved involves the extension of light rail services. The City of Sacramento General Plan Land Use Map identifies the City’s vision for future light rail stations. The majority of new light rail stations are envisioned for the North Natomas Transportation Corridor (NNTC) area extending from downtown Sacramento north and veering to the west for a destination at the Sacramento International Airport. The General Plan Land Use Map does not identify a specific future light rail station at the Greenbriar site, but it does identify a proposed light rail line extending through the site at a similar location as proposed in the project. Whether the project meets the objectives of the City for extension of light rail services to the airport will need to be decided by the City of Sacramento and Regional Transit District decision-makers.

## 2.7 SUMMARY TABLE

Information in Table 2-1, “Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures,” has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 6, “Environmental Analysis,” of this document. The summary table is arranged in four columns: environmental impacts; level of significance without mitigation; recommended mitigation measures; and level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures.

A series of mitigation measures are noted when more than one mitigation measure is required to reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level.

## 2.8 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The following provides a summary of the project's cumulative environmental impacts. A detailed discussion of the project cumulative impacts is provided in Section 7.2, "Cumulative Impacts," of this EIR.

### 2.8.1 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Under cumulative (2025) plus project conditions, the following 14 intersections would operate unacceptably:

- ▶ SR 70/99 Southbound Ramps and Elverta Road (LOS F during the a.m. peak)
- ▶ SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elverta Road (LOS F during the a.m. peak)
- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road (LOS D and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ SR 70/99 Southbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard (LOS E during the a.m. peak)
- ▶ SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard (LOS F during the a.m. peak)
- ▶ Metro Air Parkway and I-5 Northbound Ramps (LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks)
- ▶ Elverta Road and Lone Tree Road (LOS E and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Meister Way and Metro Air Parkway (LOS E and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Meister Way and Lone Tree Road (LOS D and LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Meister Way and E. Commerce Way (LOS D and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Metro Air Parkway and Bayou Road (LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks)
- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1 (LOS D and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 2 (LOS D and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)
- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 3 (LOS D and LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peaks, respectively)

The following three roadway segments are expected to operate unacceptably under cumulative plus project conditions:

- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange – LOS F
- ▶ Metro Air Parkway north of I-5 Interchange – LOS F
- ▶ Meister Way west of SR 70/99 – LOS E

The following six freeway ramps are expected to operate unacceptably under cumulative plus project conditions:

- ▶ SR 70/99 northbound to Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp – LOS F during the a.m. peak hour
- ▶ Elkhorn Boulevard to SR 70/99 southbound slip on ramp – LOS E during the p.m. peak hour
- ▶ I-5 northbound to SR 70/99 northbound off-ramp – LOS E during the a.m. peak hour
- ▶ I-5 northbound to Metro Air Parkway off-ramp - LOS F during the a.m. peak hour
- ▶ I-5 southbound to Metro Air Parkway off-ramp – LOS F during the a.m. peak hour
- ▶ Metro Air Parkway to I-5 southbound loop on-ramp – LOS F during the p.m. peak hour

The following three freeway segments are expected to operate unacceptably under cumulative plus project conditions:

- ▶ I-5 East of Powerline Road – LOS F for the northbound approach during the a.m. peak hour and the southbound approach during the p.m. peak hour
- ▶ I-5 north of Del Paso Road – LOS F for the northbound approach during the a.m. peak hour and the southbound approach during the p.m. peak hour
- ▶ I-5 north of I-5/I-80 Interchange between I-80 and Arena Boulevard Exit – LOS F for the northbound approach during the a.m. peak hour and the southbound approach during the p.m. peak hour

As shown, the project would contribute considerably to cumulative traffic impacts, increasing the number of intersections, roadway segments, and freeway ramps that operate unacceptably, and exacerbating adverse operating conditions on 3 freeway segments that would already operate poorly.

The ability to mitigate these impacts is tied to fair share contributions to regional transportation funds, but these programs are not currently available. Further, in some instances, freeway widening would be required, and this is likely not financially feasible or would require right-of-way acquisition that is not available. Please see Section 6.1, “Transportation and Circulation.” Therefore, these impacts would be *significant and unavoidable*.

## 2.8.2 AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable construction-related air quality impacts associated with generation of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified in section 6.2, “Air Quality.” Further, given the large scale of development that would occur with the cumulative projects and accounting for the nonattainment status of the SVAB for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> and other development that would occur in the SVAB, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative construction-related air quality impact and would also be expected to contribute considerably to the *significant and unavoidable* cumulative air quality impact.

Long-term emissions from related projects, considered in light of the non-attainment status of the air basin, would also be cumulatively significant. Related projects would similarly contribute to this impact. Thus, the proposed project would contribute to a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative air quality impact and the project’s contribution would be considerable.

Given that compliance with applicable rules and regulations would be required for the control of stationary source TAC emissions, both on-site and off-site, the project’s contribution to long-term cumulative increases in stationary source TAC concentrations would be considered minor and *less-than-significant*.

As described in Section 6.2, “Air Quality,” implementation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant local mobile source CO-related air quality impacts and cumulative CO emissions are not anticipated to exceed established significance criteria. Consequently, the cumulative impact of the project’s contribution to traffic volumes on the local roadway network relative to CO concentrations is considered *less than significant*.

## 2.8.3 NOISE

Because the proposed project would comply with the noise ordinance and because it is not anticipated that the proposed project would combine with any other cumulative projects to produce construction noise at sensitive receptors, it would not contribute to any significant cumulative noise impacts. This would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact

Likewise, stationary noise (i.e., noise generated by stationary on site uses), would be localized to those areas of the site where the noise would be detectable, and would not combine with other projects in the region to produce cumulative noise. This would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

As described in Section 6.3, “Noise,” implementation of the proposed project would result in significant long-term traffic-generated noise impacts under existing plus project conditions, with several homes being exposed to substantial increases in noise. Given the relative size of related projects and the fact that they would use the same roadways as the project, it is likely that cumulative development would likewise result in similar significant impacts at these sensitive receptors. The project’s contribution to the noise levels at these areas would be considerable and, as described in Section 6.3, “Noise,” mitigation is not feasible. Therefore the project would contribute considerably to this *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact.



Further, buildout of the area would result in a noticeable increase in traffic noise on major roadways. This is considered a significant cumulative traffic noise impact, and the project would contribute considerably to it. Because cumulative noise would be generated by several projects, it may require a regional program to sufficiently fund sound walls, berms, etc. It is not known if such a program would be feasible to implement. Because mitigation to sufficiently reduce noise at every existing and proposed sensitive receptor may be infeasible, this cumulative traffic noise impact is considered ***significant and unavoidable*** and the project's contribution to this impact would be considerable.

#### **2.8.4 UTILITIES**

No additional water treatment or conveyance facilities would be needed to serve the project. The project would result in a ***less-than-significant*** cumulative water supply impact.

The proposed project would contribute considerably to the need to expand the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, and the expansion would result in significant air quality impacts from ozone precursors during construction. No other unmitigated significant impacts from plant expansion were identified in the EIR prepared for the plant expansion. However, the project would contribute considerably to a ***significant and unavoidable*** cumulative impact.

With implementation of the project, no increase in the discharge rate of stormwater runoff from the site from the project would be expected, so the project would not contribute cumulatively to any stormwater runoff impacts from related development. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** cumulative impact.

On a cumulative basis, adequate electrical and natural gas facilities and services are available to meet project demands. No expansion of existing facilities would be required for the project. As a result, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative electricity and natural gas impact. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** cumulative impact.

#### **2.8.5 PUBLIC SERVICES**

The proposed project would fully provide for its increment of necessary public services and would not result in a contribution to any cumulative impacts. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** cumulative impact.

#### **2.8.6 PARKS**

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts on parks and open space because the project would provide sufficient park facilities to meet Quimby Act requirements. Similarly, development of the cumulative projects would not be expected to result in impacts related to parks and open space. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** cumulative impact.

However, conversion of the project site from predominantly agricultural and open space uses to urban development would result in a significant open space impact for which no feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. As a result, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a ***significant and unavoidable*** cumulative open space impact.

#### **2.8.7 AESTHETICS**

Implementation of the proposed project would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of agricultural land to developed urban uses, resulting in a significant aesthetic impact related to degradation of visual character. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on aesthetics, and this impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

## 2.8.8 PUBLIC HEALTH

Development of cumulative projects would not be expected to result in impacts related to public health and hazards that could not be addressed by standard mitigation and remediation measures (City of Sacramento 1993). This would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

Implementation of the project would place residents within the Sacramento International Airport's overflight safety zone and would be inconsistent with the safety standards in the comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) related to the proposed parks, commercial uses, and lightrail station that fall within the overflight safety zone. Location of these facilities in the Airport's overflight safety zone would increase safety risks associated with aircraft operations. Given that the overflight zone defines the maximum extent of defined significant safety risk, the fact that no other projects are within the overflight zone suggests that there are no other projects that contribute to this cumulative impact. The project's potential safety hazard impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

## 2.8.9 GEOLOGY

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts related to exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards, including ground shaking and liquefaction; subsidence or compression of unstable soils; and damage associated with expansive soils. However, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommendations included in the preliminary geotechnical report and a comprehensive site-specific geotechnical report for the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative geology and soils impact. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

## 2.8.10 HYDROLOGY, DRAINAGE, AND WATER QUALITY

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hydrology, drainage, and water quality. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact.

## 2.8.11 AGRICULTURE

The proposed project would convert 518 additional acres of Important agricultural land (329 acres of Prime Farmland) to urban land uses. While the EIR includes mitigation aimed at reducing the potential to cause adjacent land to convert from Important agriculture land to urban uses, the impact of the conversion of 518 acres of on-site agricultural land is a significant and unavoidable impact. In combination, the proposed project would add to the cumulative loss of farmlands associated with other development. This is considered a significant cumulative impact to which the project would have a considerable contribution. Therefore, this would be a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact.

## 2.8.12 BIOLOGY

Similar to the proposed project, additional development as proposed within the North Natomas community would result in impacts to Swainson's hawk, giant garter snake, riparian/wetland habitat, and agricultural lands/rice fields. The project would contribute to this decline. This is a considerable contribution to this significant cumulative impact. The project would be required to comply with the federal Endangered Species Act and be California Endangered Species Act. Both of these acts require that impacts to endangered species are minimized and fully mitigated. As described in Section 6.12, "Biological Resources," extensive mitigation is proposed, including the purchase and enhancement of two mitigation sites (Natomas 130 and Spangler), purchase of additional easements for Swainson's hawk habitat; along with establishment of a 250-foot linear open

space/buffer along the western edge of the Greenbriar site. Additionally, the project applicant will consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game on this mitigation plan, and would incorporate additional mitigation that arises through the consultation regarding the habitat conservation planning process. Taken together, it is expected that this mitigation would lessen the impact of the proposed project on biological resources, to the extent that they are not considerable. The project, therefore, would not contribute considerably to a cumulatively significant impact on these biological resources. This would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact of the project.

### **2.8.13 CULTURAL**

Development of the cumulative projects have the potential to result in the discovery of undocumented subsurface cultural resources or unmarked historic-era and prehistoric Native American burials. However, these potential impacts would not increase in severity in consideration of cumulative projects. In addition, the incorporation of standard measures addressing the response when undocumented resources are discovered would address this potential impact. For these reasons, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources. This would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact of the project.

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.1 Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<p><b>6.1-1: Impacts to Study Intersections.</b> Traffic volumes associated with the project would cause several study area intersections (i.e., Elverta Road and SR 70/99, Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road, SR 70/99 NB Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard, Elkhorn Boulevard and East Commerce Way, Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1, Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1, and Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1) to operate unacceptably and exceed City and County thresholds of significance for intersection operations. Because study area intersections would operate unacceptably as a result of the project, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-1a: Develop a Financial Plan (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>The applicant shall be required to develop the Greenbriar Finance Plan for review and approval by the City prior to annexation. The plan shall identify the financing mechanisms for all feasible transportation improvements defined as mitigation measures, including but not limited to, new roadways, roadways widening, traffic signals, and public transit. The project applicant shall coordinate the preparation of the finance plan with the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, and the Metro Air Park Public Facilities Financing Plan. All mitigation measures with “fair share” contributions would be implemented through the proposed financing mechanism(s) indicated in the finance plan or by some other mechanism as determined by the City of Sacramento in consultation with the Sacramento County. The Greenbriar Finance Plan shall be adopted by the City at the time the project is considered for approval. A copy of the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan is included in Appendix C of this EIR.</p>	See MM 6.1-1b through i
		<p><b>6.1-1b: Meister Way Overpass (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>The project applicant in coordination with the City shall ensure that the Meister Way overpass is constructed and in operation on or before 65% buildout of the project based on total project trips. With implementation of this improvement, operating conditions at study area intersections would substantially improve as shown in Table 6.1-30 below. Exhibit 6.1-16 shows the Baseline plus Project peak-hour turning movement volumes with the Meister Way overpass and Exhibit 6.1-17 shows the Baseline plus Project lane configurations with Meister Way overpass.</p> <p>Table 6.1-30 compares the peak-hour intersection operating conditions for Baseline No Project conditions with that of</p>	See MM 6.1-1c through i

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Baseline plus Project conditions with the Meister Way – SR 70/99 overpass.</p> <p>Construction of this improvement would primarily occur on the project site; therefore, site specific environmental impacts have been evaluated throughout this DEIR. However, this improvement would also extend east of SR 70/99 to East Commerce Way. Areas east of the project site are developed or are currently developing with urban land uses. The City has recently purchased the right-of-way for this improvement. Impacts associated with construction of this improvement would generally consist of construction-related air, noise, and traffic impacts and operational traffic impacts (e.g., re-distribution of local traffic trips). Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. Operational impacts associated with this improvement have been evaluated and are described in Table 6.1-30 and throughout this EIR (i.e., air, noise, and biological resources). Because land for this improvement has been secured by the City, a financing mechanism would be established to ensure the funding (see Mitigation Measure 6.1-1a), and construction of this improvement, and no new significant environmental impacts not already identified or evaluated in this DEIR would occur, this improvement would be considered feasible.</p> <p>Although this improvement would substantially reduce the project’s impacts to study area intersections, some intersections would continue to operate unacceptably and additional mitigation would be required to improve these intersections to an acceptable operation level. Further, other traffic improvements are necessary to ensure the safe operation of the local roadway network. As described in Table 6.1-30, with implementation of this recommended measure, the intersection</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		of SR 70/99 southbound ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard would improve to LOS D during the p.m. peak hour and the intersection of Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 2 would improve to LOS D during the a.m. peak hour. The following mitigation measures would further reduce impacts to remaining study area intersections.	
		<p><b>6.1-1c: Elverta Road and SR 70/99 (City of Sacramento, Caltrans, County)</b></p> <p>Before issuance of the first occupancy permit, the project applicant shall restripe the westbound Elverta Road approach to provide two left turn lanes, and a shared through-right turn lane (currently, a left turn lane, a shared left turn-through lane, and a right turn lane). Available right-of-way currently exists at this intersection to implement this mitigation measure. Construction outside existing right-of-way would not be required. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, operation of this intersection would improve to LOS D, which is acceptable based on Caltrans and County standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><b>6.1-1d: Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road (City of Sacramento and County)</b></p> <p>On or before 50% buildout of the project based on total project trip generation, the project applicant shall construct a traffic signal at the Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road intersection. Existing right-of-way is available to accommodate this improvement. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS B under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City and County standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	
		<p><b>6.1-1e: SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Prior to project approval, the project applicant in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City) toward the installation of a traffic signal at the SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection and shall install the traffic signal before recordation of the first map. The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement including funds collected through the Metro Air Park Finance Plan and the North Natomas Public Facilities Finance Plan. Existing right-of-way is available to accommodate this improvement. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>this mitigation measure, the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS D under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City and County standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	
		<p><b>6.1-1f: Elkhorn Boulevard and E. Commerce Way (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City) toward the installation of a traffic signal at the Elkhorn Boulevard/East Commerce Way intersection. The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to implement this improvement. Existing right-of-way is available to accommodate this improvement. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS C under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-1g: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>On or before the issuance of the first occupancy permit, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Elkhorn Boulevard/Project Street 1 intersection. With implementation of this mitigation measure the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS A under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><b>6.1-1h: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 2 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>On or before the issuance of the first occupancy permit, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Elkhorn Boulevard/Project Street 2 intersection. With implementation of this mitigation measure the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS A under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><b>6.1-i: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 3 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>On or before issuance of the first occupancy permit, the project applicant shall make revisions to the project plans so that this intersection will be restricted to right in/ right out access only. With implementation of this mitigation measure the operation of this intersection would improve to LOS B under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.1-2: Impacts to Study Area Roadway Segments.</b> The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on study area roadway segments (i.e., Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange and Meister Way west of SR 70/99) and would cause these segments to degrade from an acceptable operating condition (i.e., LOS A) to an unacceptable operating condition (i.e., LOS F). Because study area roadway segments would operate unacceptably as a result of the project, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-2a: Meister Way Overpass (City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.1-1b above (i.e., construct Meister Way overpass). Table 6.1-32 summarizes the roadway segment operation conditions for Baseline No Project conditions and Baseline plus Project conditions with the Meister way overpass. As shown in the table, even with implementation of the Meister Way overpass, two of the project’s study roadway segments (i.e., Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange and Meister Way west of SR 70/99) would continue to operate unacceptably under Baseline plus Project conditions. Therefore, additional measures are required for these intersections.</p>	See MM 6.1-2b through c
		<p><b>6.1-2b: Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange (City of Sacramento and County)</b> On or before 60% total buildout of the project based on trip generation, the project applicant shall widen Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 interchange to Lone Tree road to provide two travel lanes in each direction. Right-of-way for the recommended widening is currently available and has been secured by the City. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this roadway segment would improve to LOS A under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-2c: Meister Way west of SR 70/99 (City of Sacramento)</b>                      On or before 66% total buildout of the project based on trip generation, the project applicant shall widen Meister Way west of SR 70/99 to provide two travel lanes in each direction from the first street intersection of SR70/99 west to Lone Tree Road. Right-of-way for the recommended widening is currently available on-site. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this roadway segment would improve to LOS D under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on City standards. Therefore, impacts to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
<p><b>6.1-3: Impacts to the Freeway Ramps.</b> The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on the freeway system and would cause three study freeway ramps (i.e., SR 70/99 NB/Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp, SR 70/99 SB/I-5 SB off-ramp, and I-5 NB/SR 70/99 NB off-ramp) to operate unacceptably under Baseline plus Project conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-3a: Meister Way Overpass (City of Sacramento)</b>                      The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.1-1b above (i.e., construct the Meister Way overpass). Table 6.1-34 summarizes the peak-hour operating conditions for the study ramps under Baseline No Project conditions and Baseline plus Project conditions with the Meister Way overpass. As shown in the table, even with implementation of the Meister Way overpass, all three study freeway ramps (i.e., SR 70/99 NB/Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp, SR 70/99 SB/I-5 SB off-ramp, and I-5 NB/SR 70/99 NB off-ramp) would continue to operate unacceptably under Baseline plus Project conditions. Therefore, additional measures are required for these ramps.</p>	See MM 6.1-3b through d

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-3b: SR 70/99 Northbound to Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall implement mitigation measure 6.1-1e, which would require the installation of a traffic signal at the SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection.</p> <p>b. Before project approval, the project applicant shall in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City and Caltrans) toward the widening the off-ramp from one lane to two lanes. The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of funding needed to construct this improvement. This improvement is included in the Metro Air Park Financing Plan (MAPFP) and the North Natomas Public Facilities Finance Plan. Existing right-of-way is available to accommodate this improvement. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur.</p> <p>Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the operation of this freeway ramp would improve to LOS C under Baseline plus Project conditions, which is acceptable based on Caltrans standards. Therefore, impacts to this ramp would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-3c: SR 70/99 Southbound to I-5 Southbound on-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Widening SR 70/99 Southbound to I-5 Southbound on-ramp to provide an additional lane is required to mitigate this impact. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this freeway ramp would operate at LOS C. Caltrans District 3 Draft District System Management Plan (DSMP) includes adding a lane to the existing two-lane on-ramp for SR 70/99 southbound to I-5 southbound by the year 2010. However, to implement this mitigation measure, additional right-of-way would be required and is not currently available. Additionally, this improvement is not included in any of Caltrans' funding mechanisms. Because this mitigation measure is beyond the control of the project applicant, outside the jurisdiction of the City, and there is no established funding mechanism available for contribution, this mitigation measure is considered infeasible and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-3d: I-5 Northbound to SR 70/99 Northbound off-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Widening I-5 Northbound to SR 70/99 Northbound off-ramp to provide an additional lane is required to mitigate this impact. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this freeway ramp would operate at LOS C. Caltrans District 3 Draft DSMP does not include adding a lane to the existing two-lane on-ramp for SR 70/99 southbound to I-5 southbound by the year 2010. To implement this mitigation measure, additional right-of-way would be required and is not currently available. Additionally, this improvement is not included in any of Caltrans' funding mechanisms. Because this mitigation measure is beyond the control of the project applicant, outside the jurisdiction of the City, and there is no established funding mechanism available for contribution, this mitigation measure is considered infeasible and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.1-4: Freeway Mainline Segment Impacts.</b> The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on the freeway system and would cause four study freeway mainline segments (i.e., I-5 north of Del Paso Road, I-5 north of I-5/I-80 interchanges between I-80 and Arena Boulevard, SR 70-99 between Elverta Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, and SR 70/99 between Elkhorn Boulevard and I-5/SR 70/99 interchange) to operate unacceptably under Baseline plus Project Conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-4a: Meister Way Overpass (City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.1-1b above (i.e., construct the Meister Way overpass). Table 6.1-36 summarizes the peak-hour operating conditions for the study mainline segments under Baseline No Project conditions and Baseline plus Project conditions with the Meister way overpass. As shown in the table, even with implementation of the Meister Way overpass, all four study mainline segments (i.e., I-5 north of Del Paso Road, I-5 north of I-5/I-80 interchanges between I-80 and Arena Boulevard, SR 70/99 between Elverta Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, and SR 70/99 between Elkhorn Boulevard and I-5/SR 70/99 interchange) would continue to operate unacceptably under Baseline plus Project conditions. Therefore, additional measures are required for these mainline segments.</p>	See MM 6.1-4b through e
		<p><b>6.1-4b: I-5 North of Del Paso Road (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b> Because this mainline segment of I-5 currently operates unacceptably, the only mitigation that could improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions would be the widening of this segment of I-5 mainline to eight lanes (currently six lanes). While widening of I-5 would improve the operating conditions of this mainline segment to acceptable conditions, Caltrans currently has no plans to expand this segment of I-5 beyond its current capacity nor are any funding mechanisms established to collect monies to fund improvements such as this. Further, because of the developing nature of properties to the east and west of I-5, additional right-of-way is not available for the expansion of this freeway segment. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-4c: I-5 north of I-5/I-80 Interchange between I-80 and Arena Boulevard Exit (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Because this mainline segment of I-5 currently operates unacceptably, the only mitigation that could improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions would be the widening of this segment of I-5 mainline to eight lanes (currently six lanes). While widening of I-5 would improve the operating conditions of this mainline segment to acceptable conditions, Caltrans currently has no plans to expand this segment of I-5 beyond its current capacity nor are any funding mechanisms established to collect monies to fund improvements such as this. Further, because of the developing nature of properties to the east and west of I-5, additional right-of-way is not available for the expansion of this freeway segment. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-4d: SR 70/99 Southbound between Elverta Road and Elkhorn Boulevard (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Because this mainline segment of SR 70/99 currently operates unacceptably, widening this segment of SR 70/99 mainline to 3 lanes (currently 2 lanes) between Elkhorn Boulevard and Elverta Road would improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions to an acceptable LOS. Widening of the segment is not included in Caltrans' DSMP. While widening of SR 70/99 would improve the operating conditions of this mainline segment to acceptable conditions, Caltrans currently has no plans to expand this segment of SR 70/99 beyond its current capacity nor are any funding mechanisms established to fund improvements such as this. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-4e: SR 70/99 between Elkhorn Boulevard and I-5/SR 70/99 Interchange (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Because this mainline segment of SR 70/99 currently operates unacceptably, the only mitigation that could improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions would be the widening this segment of SR 70/99 mainline to six lanes (currently 4 lanes) between Elkhorn Boulevard and Elverta Road. While widening of SR 70/99 would improve the operating conditions of this mainline segment to acceptable conditions, Caltrans currently has no plans to expand this segment of SR 70/99 beyond its current capacity nor are any funding mechanisms established to collect monies to fund improvements such as this. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project’s impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<p><b>6.1-5. Cumulative Traffic Impacts to Study Area Intersections.</b> Traffic volumes associated with the project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would cause several study area intersections to operate unacceptably and exceed City County, and Caltrans thresholds of significance for intersection operations. This would be a significant cumulative impact and the project’s contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-5a: Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road (City of Sacramento and County)</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall provide an expanded intersection with a right turn pocket length of 200 feet for vehicles turning right onto northbound Lone Tree Road from the westbound Elkhorn Boulevard approach. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the project would increase the average delay at this intersection by only 2.8 seconds, which is below City standards (i.e., 5 seconds). Construction associated with this mitigation measure would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site and therefore no new environmental impacts would occur. The applicant in consultation with the City shall coordinate with County to secure additional right-of-way for this improvement. However, because this intersection is located within the County and is not subject to the City’s jurisdiction, implementation of this measure can not be guaranteed.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.	
		<p><b>6.1-5b: SR 70/99 Southbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City and Caltrans) toward the restriping of the SR 70/99 southbound off-ramp approach to provide a left-turn lane, a shared left turn-right turn lane, and two right-turn lanes (cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. Sufficient right-of-way would be available with the future intersection configuration to accommodate these improvements without resulting in substantial alteration or expansion of this intersection. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this intersection would operate at LOS D and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><b>6.1-5c: SR 70/99 Northbound Ramps and Elkhorn Boulevard (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City) toward the restriping of the SR 70/99 northbound off-ramp approach to provide two left-turn lanes, a shared left turn-right turn lane, and a right-turn lane (cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. Sufficient right-of-way would be available with the future intersection lane configuration to accommodate these improvements without resulting in substantial alteration or expansion of this intersection. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this intersection would operate at LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	
		<p><b>6.1-5d: Metro Air Parkway and I-5 Northbound Ramps (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City) toward the restriping of the I-5 northbound off-ramp approach to provide a left-turn lane, a shared left turn-right turn lane and two right-turn lanes</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		(cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. This improvement would not require any additional right-of-way and would not in substantial alteration or expansion of this intersection. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this intersection would operate at LOS F in the a.m. and LOS E in the p.m. peak hour and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.	
		<b>6.1-5e: Meister Way and Metro Air Parkway (City of Sacramento)</b> Adding a left-turn lane and restriping the westbound Meister Way approach to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared, through right-turn lane (cumulative base lane geometry assumes a left turn lane, a through lane, and a right turn lane) would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, construction of this mitigation measure would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way which is not controlled by the applicant. Although implementation of this measure would reduce the project’s cumulative impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether additional right-of-way could be secured and whether this measure would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	SU
		<b>6.1-5f: Meister Way and Lone Tree Road (City of Sacramento)</b> Adding a left-turn lane for the eastbound and westbound Meister Way approaches, and southbound Lone Tree Road approach would improve the operations of this intersection to LOS C and would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Sufficient right-of-way could be secured by the applicant for the westbound approach; however, right-of-way along eastbound and southbound approach is controlled by the County and not	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		within the City’s jurisdiction. Although implementation of this measure would reduce the project’s cumulative impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether additional right-of-way could be secured and whether this measure would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	
		<p><b>6.1-5g: Meister Way and E. Commerce Way (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>On or before 65% buildout of the project based on the project’s total trips, the project applicant shall revise the improvement plan to provide a left-turn lane for the northbound East Commerce Way approach, an additional lane for the eastbound Meister Way approach, and restripe the eastbound Meister Way approach to provide a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane (base cumulative lane geometry assumed to have a shared left turn-right turn lane for the eastbound approach). Sufficient right-of-way is currently available to accommodate these improvements without resulting in substantial alteration or expansion of this intersection. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this intersection would operate at LOS C and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
		<p><b>6.1-5h: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 1 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Construction of an additional through lane for the eastbound and westbound Elkhorn Boulevard approaches (cumulative base lane geometry assumes three through lanes in each direction on</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		Elkhorn Boulevard) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, this measure would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way beyond the maximum right-of-way proposed by the City/County for this roadway. No other feasible measures are available to reduce this impact because of limited right-of-way. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	
		<p><b>6.1-5i: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 2 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Construction of an additional through lane for the eastbound and westbound Elkhorn Boulevard approaches (cumulative base lane geometry assumes three through lanes in each direction on Elkhorn Boulevard) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, this measure would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way beyond the maximum right-of-way proposed by the City/ County for this roadway. No other feasible measures are available to reduce this impact because of limited right-of-way. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-5j: Elkhorn Boulevard and Project Street 3 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>Construction of an additional through lane for the eastbound and westbound Elkhorn Boulevard approaches (cumulative base lane geometry assumes three through lanes in each direction on Elkhorn Boulevard) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, this measure would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way beyond the ultimate right-of-way proposed by the City for this roadway. To improve the operations of this intersection under cumulative conditions, before buildout of the project, the project applicant shall restrict the left turn in/out movement at this intersection so that it will be right in/ right out movement only with a stop sign control on the side street. Although the operation of this intersection would</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		improve, it would not cause this intersection to operate at an acceptable level (e.g., LOS D or better). No other mitigation is available to reduce this impact. As a result, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	
<p><b>6.1-6: Cumulative Impacts to Study Area Roadway Segments.</b> The proposed project in combination with cumulative projects would increase traffic volumes on study area roadway segments and would cause these segments (i.e., Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange, Metro Air Parkway north of I-5 Interchange, and Meister Way west of SR 70/99) to degrade from an acceptable operating condition (i.e., LOS A) to an unacceptable operating condition (i.e., LOS F). Because study area roadway segments would operate unacceptably as a result of the project, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-6a: Elkhorn Boulevard west of SR 70/99 Interchange (City of Sacramento)</b> Widening Elkhorn Boulevard to eight lanes (4 in each direction) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City includes widening of Elkhorn Boulevard to six lanes within its General Plan; widening to eight lanes is not feasible nor planned by the City. Therefore, before project approval, the project applicant shall, in coordination with the City, establish a funding mechanism to fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs towards widening Elkhorn Boulevard to six lanes west of the SR 70/99 Interchange (the number of lanes planned by the City of Sacramento). The City and developers of the MAP project have identified 100% of the funding necessary to widen the Elkhorn Boulevard/SR 70/99 overpass to six lanes. No other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, while reduced, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-6b: Meister Way west of SR 70/99(City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall implement Mitigation measure 6.1-2c. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this segment would operate at LOS B and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS
<p><b>6.1-7: Cumulative Impacts to Study Area Freeway Ramps.</b> The proposed project in combination with cumulative projects would increase traffic volumes on the freeway system and would cause six study freeway ramps (i.e., SR 70/99</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-7a: SR 70/99 Northbound to Elkhorn Boulevard off-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b> The project applicant shall implement mitigation measure 6.1-5c, which requires a funding mechanism for the re-striping the</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Northbound to Elkhorn Boulevard off ramp, Elkhorn Boulevard to SR 70/99 Southbound slip on ramp, I-5 Northbound to SR 70/99 Northbound off ramp, I-5 Northbound to Metro Air Parkway off-ramp, I-5 Southbound to Metro Air Parkway off ramp, and Metro Air Parkway to I-5 Southbound loop on ramp) to operate unacceptably under Cumulative plus Project conditions and exceed Caltrans thresholds of significance for freeway ramp operations. This would be a significant cumulative impact and the project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.</p>		<p>SR 70/99 northbound off-ramp approach to provide two left-turn lanes, a shared left turn-right turn lane and a right-turn lane (cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). With implementation of this mitigation measure and widening this ramp from one lane to two lanes, this ramp would operate at LOS C and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, these ramps are not under the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento (i.e., subject to Caltrans jurisdiction). While the project would contribute funds that would implement measures that would fully mitigate impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether these measures would be implemented because they are not subject to the control of the City. As a result, for purposes of CEQA, cumulative impacts to these intersections would be considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	
		<p><b>6.1-7b: Elkhorn Boulevard to SR 70/99 Southbound diagonal on-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b> Widening the on-ramp to provide an additional lane would reduce the impact of the project to a less-than-significant level and the on-ramp would operate at LOS C. However, widening of the on-ramp is not included in Caltrans' DSMP and Caltrans does not have any funding mechanisms to implement this improvement. Therefore, this mitigation measure is considered infeasible and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-7c: I-5 Northbound to SR 70/99 Northbound off-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b> Widening the on-ramp to provide an additional lane would improve the operating condition on this off-ramp to LOS C. The project would contribute approximately 4% of the total a.m. peak-hour trips at this off-ramp and would be required to pay a 4% fairshare contribution toward implementing a feasible mitigation measure, if available. Widening of the off-ramp is not</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		included in Caltrans' DSMP and Caltrans does not have any funding mechanisms to implement this improvement. Furthermore, widening the off-ramp would require additional right-of-way which is not controlled by the project applicant and is not within the jurisdiction of the City. Therefore, this mitigation measure is considered infeasible and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	
		<p><b>6.1-7d: I-5 Northbound to Metro Air Parkway off-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall implement mitigation measure 6.1-5d, which requires the establishment of a funding mechanism for restriping the I-5 northbound off-ramp approach to provide a left turn lane, a shared left turn-right turn lane and two right turn lanes (cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). With implementation of this mitigation measure, this ramp would operate at LOS D and this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, these ramps are not under the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento (i.e., subject to Caltrans jurisdiction). While the project would contribute funds that would implement measures that would fully mitigate impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether these measures would be implemented because they are not subject to the control of the City. As a result, for purposes of CEQA, cumulative impacts to these intersections would be considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
		<p><b>6.1-7e: I-5 Southbound to Metro Air Parkway off-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City) toward the re-striping the I-5 southbound off-ramp approach to provide two left-turn lanes, a shared left turn-right turn lane and a right-turn lane (cumulative base lane geometry assumes two left turn and two right turn lanes). The Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. Sufficient right-of-way is currently available to accommodate these improvements without resulting in expansion of this intersection. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. The project would contribute approximately 3% of the total a.m. peak-hour trips at this off-ramp and as a result shall contribute 3% to construction of this improvement. Caltrans would be the agency responsible for implementation of this measure and as a result the City would be required to coordinate with Caltrans on the funding of this improvement. Caltrans’ District 3 DSMP includes the I-5/Metro Air Parkway Interchange, but does not identify specific improvements or project construction date. Construction of I-5 Southbound to Metro Air Park off-ramp is included in Metro Air Park Finance Plan, so the applicant would be required to pay its fair share contribution in conjunction with Metro Air Park finance plan toward the construction of this improvement. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this freeway ramp would operate at LOS C; therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, these ramps are not under the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento (i.e., subject to Caltrans jurisdiction). While the project would contribute funds that would implement measures</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		that would fully mitigate impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether these measures would be implemented because they are not subject to the control of the City. As a result, for purposes of CEQA, cumulative impacts to these intersections would be considered significant and unavoidable.	
		<p><b>6.1-7f: Metro Air Parkway to I-5 Southbound loop on-ramp (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Before project approval, the project applicant shall in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan to fully fund necessary traffic mitigation. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs (determined in consultation with the City and Caltrans) toward the widening of the on-ramp to provide an additional lane. The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. Sufficient right-of-way is currently available to accommodate these improvements without resulting in expansion of this intersection. Based on “windshield surveys” of the project area, the site proposed for this improvement is substantially similar to the project site. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the project’s construction-related impacts and no new significant impacts would occur. Mitigation recommended for the project would also substantially reduce construction-related impacts associated with this measure. The project would contribute approximately 1% of the total p.m. peak-hour trips at this off-ramp and as a result shall contribute 1% to construction of this improvement. Caltrans would be the agency responsible for implementation of this measure and as a result the project applicant would be required to coordinate with Caltrans on the funding of this improvement. Caltrans’ District 3 DSMP includes the I-5/Metro Air Parkway Interchange, but does not</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>identify specific improvements or project construction date. Additionally, the construction of Metro Air Parkway to I-5 southbound loop on-ramp is included in the Metro Air Park Finance Plan, so the applicant would be required to pay its fair share contribution in conjunction with Metro Air Park finance plan toward the construction of this improvement. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this freeway ramp would operate at LOS D; therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, these ramps are not under the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento (i.e., subject to Caltrans jurisdiction). While the project would contribute funds that would implement measures that would fully mitigate impacts to this intersection to a less-than-significant level, it is unknown whether these measures would be implemented because they are not subject to the control of the City. As a result, for purposes of CEQA, cumulative impacts to these intersections would be considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	
<p><b>6.1-8: Cumulative Freeway Mainline Segment Impacts.</b> The proposed project in combination with cumulative projects would increase traffic volumes on the freeway system and would cause three study freeway mainline segments (i.e., I-5 east of Powerline Road, I-5 north of Del Paso Road, I-5 north of I-5/I-80 interchanges between I-80 and Arena Boulevard) to operate unacceptably under Cumulative plus Project Conditions. These intersections would operate unacceptably under Cumulative no Project conditions; however, the project would contribute additional trips to these intersections, which is unacceptable based on Caltrans standards. This would be a cumulatively significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-8a: I-5 east of Powerline Road to the MAP Interchange (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b> Because this mainline segment of I-5 would operate unacceptably under Cumulative No Project conditions, widening this segment to eight lanes (currently four lanes) would improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions to an acceptable LOS. The Caltrans’ District 3 DSMP includes adding an HOV lane to I-5 by the year 2020 and according to Metro Air Park Finance Plan, this segment of I-5 would be upgraded to six lanes with buildout of the Metro Air Park project. Therefore, prior to recordation of the first map, the project applicant shall, in coordination with the City, prepare a City Council-approved Finance Plan. This funding mechanism shall be in conformance with the Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan presented in Appendix C. This funding mechanism shall ensure that the project applicant will pay their fair-share costs,</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>determined in consultation with the City and in coordination with the Metro Air Park Finance Plan, toward the widening of I-5 to six lanes. No other right-of-way is available to widen this segment to eight lanes. The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan identifies 100% of the funding needed to construct this improvement. Additional right-of-way to accommodate the expansion of this freeway segment beyond six lanes is not available because of the developing nature of properties to the east and west of I-5. While expansion of this freeway segment would reduce the project's cumulative traffic impacts to this freeway segment, it would not reduce the project's cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level because widening to eight lanes is not feasible. No other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, while reduced, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	
		<p><b>6.1-8b: I-5 north of Del Paso Road (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b>                      Widening this segment of I-5 mainline to 10 lanes (currently six lanes) would improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions to an acceptable LOS. The Caltrans District 3 DSMP includes adding an HOV lane to I-5 by the year 2020 but no funding mechanism for this project is defined. No other freeway expansion projects are planned for this segment of I-5. Further, because of the developing nature of properties to the east and west of I-5, additional right-of-way is not available for the expansion of this freeway segment. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>6.1-8c: I-5 north of I-5/I-80 Interchange between I-80 and Arena Boulevard Exit (City of Sacramento and Caltrans)</b></p> <p>Because this mainline segment of I-5 would operate unacceptably under Cumulative No Project conditions, widening this segment of I-5 mainline to 12 lanes (currently six lanes) would improve the operating conditions of this segment during peak conditions to an acceptable LOS. The Caltrans District 3 DSMP includes adding an HOV lane to I-5 by the year 2020 but no funding mechanism for this project is available. No other freeway expansion projects are planned for this segment of I-5. Further, because of the developing nature of properties to the east and west of I-5, additional right-of-way is not available for the expansion of this freeway segment. Because no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project’s impacts to this mainline segment, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU
<p><b>6.1-9: Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Impacts.</b> The project would add pedestrian demands within the project site and to and from proposed commercial, retail, and light-rail land uses. Specific information on improvements to on and off-site bicycle and pedestrian facilities is not available at this time. Because the project would add demand for pedestrians and bicycle facilities for which facilities may not be available. This would be a potentially significant bicycle and pedestrian circulation impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-9: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. Prior to recordation of the first map, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City of Sacramento Development Engineering and Finance Division to identify the necessary on- and off-site pedestrian and bicycle facilities to serve the proposed development. These facilities shall be incorporated into the project and could include: sidewalks, stop signs, in-pavement lighted crosswalks, standard pedestrian and school crossing warning signs, lane striping to provide a bicycle lane, bicycle parking, signs to identify pedestrian and bicycle paths, marked and raised crosswalks, and pedestrian signal heads.</p> <p>b. Circulation and access to all proposed parks and public spaces shall include sidewalks that meet American with Disability Act Standards.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. The project applicant shall dedicate a buffer along the edges of the project site (south, east, and west) to the City of Sacramento. This buffer shall be landscaped by the project applicant and shall provide space for future 10-foot off-street bikeways that would connect residents and employees to the NNCP area and other Class I bike facilities. The buffer on the western edge of the project site shall not encroach on the 250-foot linear open space/buffer proposed for giant garter snake habitat.</li> <li>d. The project applicant shall provide on-street bicycle lanes 5-6-feet wide within the community. Details on the design and siting of these bike lanes shall be done in consultation with the City of Sacramento Development Engineering and Finance Division.</li> <li>e. Bicycle parking shall conform to City standards and shall be located in high visibility areas to encourage bicycle travel. Class I (i.e., bicycle lockers) and Class II (i.e., racks) bicycle facilities shall be provided throughout the commercial areas of the project, at a ratio of 1 bicycle storage space for every 20 off-street vehicle parking spaces required. Fifty percent of the storage spaces shall be Class I facilities and the remaining 50% shall be Class II facilities.</li> <li>f. The project applicant shall provide residents, tenants, and employees of the project site with information regarding the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Rideshare bicycle commuting program.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.1-10: Demand for Public Transportation.</b> Public transit is not currently provided to the project site. At the time the project application was submitted to the City, no plans for the provision of public transit services were proposed. The project would increase demands for public transit facilities, none of which are proposed to be provided to the project site.</p>	S	<p><b>6.1-10: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prior to the construction and operation of RT's proposed LRT station along Meister Way, the project applicant shall fund and operate an interim shuttle/bus transportation service for residents and patrons of the project site. The project applicant shall develop this interim transit service in consultation with the City of Sacramento and the RT. The</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Therefore, the project would result in a significant public transportation impact.		<p>interim transit service shall provide transit services for peak commute periods. To promote the use of public transit services, the project applicant at the sale of proposed residences shall promote the availability of transit services. Once demand for public transit services reaches 50 service requests, the project applicant shall begin to provide transit services and shall increase those services in proportion to the development levels and increased rider ship levels occurring on the project site.</p> <p>b. The transit service shall take residents to the Central Business District (CBD) (i.e., downtown Sacramento) where they can transfer to light rail, bus, or train and connect to anywhere in greater Sacramento region and to the Bay Area. The transit service shall connect residents to the following transit services: Sacramento Regional Transit, El Dorado Transit, Yuba-Sutter Transit, Yolo Bus, Placer County Transit, San Joaquin Transit, Fairfield/Suisun Transit, Amador Transit, Roseville Transit, ETRAN (Elk Grove), and the Capitol Corridor/Amtrak. Midday service shall also be considered as development and rider ship demands increase.</p> <p>c. Final design and operation of the transit service will be subject to the approval of the City and other proposed operating agencies (e.g., RT).</p>	
<p><b>6.1-11: Construction-Related Impacts.</b> Construction activities for the project would result in the generation of 50 one-way truck trips per day associated with construction activities and 500 one-way vehicle trips (250 construction workers on-site on a worst-case basis) associated with construction personnel. All construction personnel and vehicles would access the project site from Elkhorn Boulevard and would park in designated areas on the project site. No on-street parking would occur. Although the construction trips</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-11: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. Prior to issuance of grading permits for the project site, the project applicant shall prepare a detailed Traffic Management Plan that will be subject to review and approval by the City Department of Transportation, Caltrans, Sacramento County, and local emergency services providers including the City of Sacramento fire and police departments. The plan shall ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>would be temporary, because of the size of this project and the large number of personnel required on a daily basis, the project’s construction trips could substantially increase local roadway volumes and interfere with the safe and efficient operation of these roadways. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>maintained. At a minimum, the plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the number of truck trips, time an day of street closures,</li> <li>• time of day of arrival and departure of trucks,</li> <li>• limitations on the size and type of trucks, provision of a truck staging area with a limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting,</li> <li>• provision of a truck circulation pattern,</li> <li>• provision of driveway access plan along Elkhorn Boulevard so that safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movements are maintained (e.g., steel plates, minimum distances of open trenches, and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas),</li> <li>• maintain safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles,</li> <li>• manual traffic control when necessary,</li> <li>• proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures, and</li> <li>• provisions for pedestrian safety.</li> </ul> <p>b. A copy of the construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to local emergency response agencies and these agencies shall be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct local roadways.</p>	
<p><b>6.1-12. Conformity with City Parking Requirements.</b> A detailed parking plan has not been submitted by the project applicant. As a result, it is unknown whether adequate parking would be provided on the project site for residential, commercial, and retail land uses. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-12: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall submit a detailed parking plan for each proposed land use at the time development entitlements (e.g., building permits or special permits) are sought. The parking plan shall ensure that parking provided on the project site would meet the City’s most current parking standards for the proposed land use and it shall identify the number and location of proposed parking spaces including proposed handicap</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		parking spaces. If a light rail station is constructed within project site, then a park and ride lot or park and ride spaces shall be allocated in the retail zoned area in the vicinity of the proposed LRT station. The parking plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the City Development Engineering and Finance Division.	
<p><b>6.1-13. Project Site Access Impacts.</b> The project would construct 5 new access points to the project site along Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road and 3 access points along Meister Way. With implementation of the project and recommended traffic improvements, access from Elkhorn Boulevard and Lone Tree Road would be adequate. However, access points along Meister Way would be uncontrolled and with project build out could result in unsafe site access conditions (e.g., long queues of vehicles, left-turns across free flow traffic). Therefore, this would be a potentially significant site access impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-13: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prior to 40% buildout of the project site based on total project trips, an exclusive left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane for the project side streets with stop control shall be provided at the three four legged project intersections along Meister Way.</li> <li>b. An exclusive left turn lane for vehicles turning left from the eastbound and westbound Meister Way approaches shall be provided at these intersections. Exhibit 6.1-18 shows the proposed traffic controls throughout the project site.</li> <li>c. Final design and siting of these improvements shall be subject to the approval of the City Development Engineering and Finance Division, Development Services Department.</li> </ul>	LTS
<p><b>6.1-14. Impacts to Internal Circulation.</b> Some elements of the internal roadway network (e.g., long, straight streets) could encourage vehicle speeding, which could lead to vehicle safety impact. This would be a potentially significant internal circulation impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-14: Traffic Calming Measures (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>During review of the project’s tentative map and project entitlements, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City to identify roadways where traffic calming measures including but not limited to narrow travel lanes, speed bumps, round-a-bouts, raised intersections, and stop controls are needed to ensure the orderly, efficient, and safe flow of traffic. Design and siting of these facilities would be subject to approval by the City Development Engineering and Finance Division, Development Services Department.</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.1-15: Impacts to Emergency Vehicle Access.</b> The project would provide adequate emergency access to the project site. However, construction vehicles could temporarily obstruct local roadways, which could impair the ability of local agencies to respond to an emergency in the project area. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.1-15: Emergency Access (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. During review of the project’s tentative map and project entitlements, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City Development Engineering and Finance Division, Development Services Department, Fire Department, and Police Department staff to ensure that the roadways provide adequate access for emergency vehicles (i.e., turning radii, lane width).</p> <p>b. The project applicant shall implement mitigation measure 6.1-12 (Construction Traffic Management Plan).</p>	LTS
6.2 Air Quality			
<p><b>6.2-1: Short Term Construction-Generated Emissions.</b> Construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> would exceed SMAQMD’s significance threshold of 85 lb/day, and because of the project’s size, PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would result in or substantially contribute to emission concentrations that exceed the CAAQS. In addition, because Sacramento County is currently designated as a nonattainment area for both ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>, construction-generated emissions could further contribute to pollutant concentrations that exceed the CAAQS. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.2-1: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>In accordance with the recommendations of the SMAQMD, the project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce temporary construction emissions.</p> <p>a. The project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and visible emissions from heavy-duty diesel equipment.</p> <p>i. Before issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall provide a plan for approval by the lead agency, in consultation with SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt;50 horsepower), off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, particulate matter traps, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or such other options as become available.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1087 315 1749 743">ii. Before issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall submit to the lead agency and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 hp, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of project construction. 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 operations occur. At least 48 hours before heavy-duty off-road equipment is used, the project applicant shall provide the SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and the name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.</li> <li data-bbox="1087 751 1749 1333">iii. Before issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall ensure that emissions from 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 (for white smoke) or Ringlemann 2.0 (for black smoke) shall be repaired immediately, and the SMAQMD shall be notified of non-compliant equipment within 48 hours of identification. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly by the construction contractor, and the contractor shall submit a monthly summary of visual survey results throughout the duration of the construction project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction operations occur. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed, as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance.</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. As recommended by the SMAQMD, the project applicant shall reduce fugitive dust emissions by implementing the measures listed below during construction.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. All disturbed areas, including storage piles that are not being actively used for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, a chemical stabilizer or suppressant, or vegetative ground cover. Soil shall be kept moist at all times.</li> <li>ii. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or a chemical stabilizer or suppressant.</li> <li>iii. When materials are transported off-site (e.g., trees, plantings), all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or maintained with at least 2 feet of freeboard space from the top of the container.</li> <li>iv. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of project-generated mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring.</li> <li>v. After materials are added to or removed from the surfaces of outdoor storage piles, the storage piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions using sufficient water or a chemical stabilizer or suppressant.</li> <li>vi. Onsite vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>vii. Wheel washers shall be installed for all trucks and equipment exiting unpaved areas, or wheels shall be washed to remove accumulated dirt before such vehicles leave the site.</li> <li>viii. Sandbags or straw waddles shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from adjacent project areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>with a slope greater than 1%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ix. Excavation and grading activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 mph.</li> <li>x. The extent of areas simultaneously subject to excavation and grading shall be limited, wherever possible, to the minimum area feasible.</li> <li>xi. Emulsified diesel, diesel catalysts, or SMAQMD-approved equal, shall be used on applicable heavy-duty construction equipment that can be operated effectively and safely with the alternative fuel type.</li> </ul> <p>c. The applicant shall pay \$1,525,537 into SMAQMD's off-site construction mitigation fund to further mitigate construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> that exceed SMAQMD's daily emission threshold of 85 lb/day. The calculation of daily NO<sub>x</sub> emissions is based on the current cost of \$14,300 to reduce a ton of NO<sub>x</sub>. The determination of the final mitigation fee shall be conducted in coordination with SMAQMD. The fee shall be paid to the SMAQMD prior to any ground disturbance in total or on an acre bases (\$5,959.13/acre) as development occurs and permits are sought. (See Appendix D for calculation worksheet.)</p> <p>d. In addition to the measures identified above, construction operations are required to comply with all applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would substantially reduce construction emissions; however, project emissions would still exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	
<p><b>6.2-2: Generation of Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> Long-term operation of the proposed project would result in emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants that would exceed SMAQMD's threshold.</p>	S	<p><b>6.2-2: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>When a proposed project's operational emissions are estimated to exceed SMAQMD's threshold of significance of 65 lb/day for ROG or NO<sub>x</sub>, an Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Appendix E) to</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Furthermore, the project’s operational emissions would potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. As a result, this impact would be considered significant.</p>		<p>reduce operational emissions by a minimum of 15% shall be submitted to the SMAQMD for approval. The following mitigation has been chosen from SMAQMD’s most current recommended land use reduction measure and shall be incorporated to achieve a 15% reduction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Non-residential land uses shall provide bicycle lockers and/or racks (commercial).</li> <li>b. Nonresidential land uses shall provide personal showers and lockers for employees (commercial).</li> <li>c. Bicycle storage (Class I) shall be provided at apartment complexes or condos without garages (residential).</li> <li>d. Entire project shall be located within 1/2 mile of a Class I or Class II bike lane and provide a comparable bikeway connection to that existing facility (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>e. The project shall provide for pedestrian facilities and improvements such as overpasses and wider sidewalks (e.g., 5-foot) (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>f. Preferential parking shall be provided for carpools/vanpools (commercial).</li> <li>g. High density residential, mixed, or retail/commercial uses shall be within 1/4 mile of planned light rail, linking with activity centers and other planned infrastructure (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>h. Parking lot design shall include clearly marked and shaded pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances (commercial).</li> <li>i. Setback distance shall be minimized between development and planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor (commercial, mixed).</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. Neighborhood shall serve as focal point with parks, school and civic uses within 1/4 mile (residential, mixed).</li> <li>k. Separate, safe, and convenient bicycle and pedestrian paths shall connect residential, commercial, and office uses (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>l. The project shall provide a development pattern that eliminates physical barriers such as walls, berms, landscaping, and slopes between residential and non-residential uses that impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation (commercial, mixed).</li> <li>m. Wood-burning fireplaces shall be prohibited, and if natural gas fireplaces are installed they shall be the lowest emitting commercially available (residential).</li> <li>n. The lowest emitting commercially available furnaces shall be installed (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>o. Ozone destruction catalyst shall be installed on air conditioning systems in consultation with SMAQMD (residential, commercial, mixed).</li> <li>p. Loading and unloading facilities shall be provided for transit and carpool/vanpool users (commercial).</li> <li>q. Average residential density shall be seven dwelling units per acre or greater (residential).</li> <li>r. The project shall be mixed-use and consist of at least three of the following on-site and/or within 1/4 mile; residential development, retail development, personal services, open space, and, office space (mixed).</li> </ul> <p>Although the above mitigation measures would substantially reduce the project's operational emissions, they would not reduce the project's operational emissions below SMAQMD's significance thresholds (refer to Table 6.2-4). As a result, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.2-3: Generation of Local Mobile-Source CO Emissions.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to localized mobile-source CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm and 9.0 ppm, respectively. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.2-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in the exposure of existing sensitive receptors to minor increases in short-term construction emissions and future residents closest to I-5 and SR 70/99 to mobile source TAC emissions that elevate their health risks compared to other areas on the site and in the Sacramento region in general. There are no accepted or prescribed thresholds for exposure to the impacts of TAC emissions from mobile sources. Consequently, although there is a potential that exposure to mobile sources along the margins of the site closest to the freeways would result in elevated health risk compared with other areas of the site, an accurate quantifiable risk is not possible. Further, in view of the on-going state and federal regulatory programs which have demonstrated significant reductions in health risks from toxic air contaminants in the Sacramento area (as well as throughout the state), and forecasted future improvements as a result of continued implementation of these existing regulatory programs, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.2-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo) Offsite Mobile Sources.</b> The following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proposed facilities that would require the long-term use of diesel equipment and heavy-duty trucks shall develop and implement a plan to reduce emissions, which may include such measures as scheduling such activities when the residential uses are the least occupied, and requiring such equipment to be shut off when not in use and prohibiting heavy-trucks from idling. The plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City before loading dock activities begin. Copies of the plan shall be provided to all residential dwellings located within 1,000 feet of loading dock areas.</li> <li>b. Proposed commercial/convenience land uses (e.g., loading docks) that have the potential to emit toxic air emissions shall be located as far away as feasibly possible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.</li> </ul> <p>Although above mitigation would reduce health-related risks associated with on-site mobile-source TACs, they would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	SU
<p><b>6.2-5: Exposure to Odor Emissions.</b> Operation of the proposed project could result in the frequent exposure of on-site receptors to substantial objectionable odor emissions. As a result, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.2-5: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To the extent feasible, proposed commercial/convenience land uses that have the potential to emit objectionable odor</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		emissions shall be located as far away as possible from existing and proposed receptors. b. When permitting the facility that would occupy the proposed commercial/convenience space, the City shall take into consideration its odor-producing potential. c. If an odor-emitting facility is to occupy space in the commercial/convenience area, the City shall require odor control devices (e.g., wet chemical scrubbers, activated carbon scrubbers, biologically-active filters, enclosures) to be installed to reduce the exposure of receptors to objectionable odor emissions.	
<b>6.3 Noise</b>			
<b>6.3-1: Short-term Construction Noise.</b> Short-term construction-generated noise levels could exceed City of Sacramento Noise Code standards (Table 6.3-9) or result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels at existing nearby off-site sensitive land uses as well as on-site residences that are constructed and inhabited before other portions of the project are complete. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<b>6.3-1: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> Construction operations shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday.	LTS
<b>6.3-2: Long-Term Operational Traffic Noise.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in increases in traffic noise levels greater than 4 dBA and cause traffic noise levels to exceed the County's 60 dBA L <sub>dn</sub> /CNEL exterior noise standard at sensitive receptors in unincorporated Sacramento County. This would be a significant impact.	S	<b>6.3-2: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> The project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce the exposure of existing sensitive receptors to project-generated traffic noise levels. a. As individual facilities and elements of the proposed project are permitted by the City, the City shall evaluate each for compliance with the County's exterior noise standard and the substantial increase threshold [i.e., relative to existing levels attributed to existing year 2005 traffic volumes (Section 6.1, "Transportation and Circulation")] for transportation noise sources at the existing residences in unincorporated Sacramento County located along Lone Tree Road south of	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Elkhorn Boulevard (house is 50 feet west of centerline of Lone Tree Road), Power Line Road between Elkhorn Boulevard and Del Paso Road (house is located 80 feet east of centerline of Power Line Road), and Elkhorn Boulevard between Power Line Road and Lone Tree Road (houses are located 575 feet south of centerline of Elkhorn Boulevard and 175 feet south of centerline of Elkhorn Road). Where traffic noise levels generated by individual projects do not clearly comply with the County’s exterior noise standards or result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels at these locations, the City shall offer the owners of the affected residences the installation of solid barriers (e.g., berms, wall, and/or fences) along their affected property line. Actual installation of the barriers/fences would either be funded by, or completed by the project applicant. The barriers/fences must be constructed of solid material (e.g., wood, brick, or adobe) and be of sufficient density and height to minimize exterior noise levels. The barriers/fences shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that agrees with the color and character of nearby residences, and not become the dominant visual element of the community. Where there is a question regarding premitigation or postmitigation noise levels in a particular area, site-specific noise studies/modeling may be conducted to determine compliance or noncompliance with standards. Funding for the installation of this mitigation measure shall be provided by the project applicant.</p> <p>The County allows for an exterior noise level of up to 65 dBA CNEL/L<sub>dn</sub> provided that practical exterior noise level reduction measures are implemented. The installation of noise barriers/fences could achieve an approximate 5 dB noise level reduction where the line-of-sight from the nearby roadways to the existing residences would be broken and 1.5 dB of additional noise level reduction for each meter of barrier height beyond the</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		line-of-sight. Thus, a 5 to 10 dB noise reduction could be achieved, resulting in the reduction of traffic-generated noise levels at existing sensitive receptors to levels less than the 65 dBA standard. However, the placement of barriers/fences could be considered infeasible due to their effect on the aesthetic character of these roadways, the spacing between the existing residences and nearby roadways, and the presence of driveways which would prohibit a continuous structure. In addition, even with implementation of the above measure and the reduction of noise levels to below the standard, a substantial increase could still result along Elkhorn Boulevard, where project implementation would result in an approximate 13.5 dB increase. As a result, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	
<b>6.3-3: Stationary and Area-Source Noise.</b> Noise levels generated by stationary- and area-noise sources on the project site would not exceed the Noise Control Standards of the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento Code at existing nearby noise-sensitive land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact of the proposed project.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<b>6.3-4: Land Use Compatibility of Proposed Residential and School Uses with On-site Daily and Hourly Average (<math>L_{dn}</math>/CNEL and <math>L_{eq}</math>) Noise Levels.</b> With implementation of the proposed project, residential land uses (sensitive receptors) proposed on the project site would be exposed to future noise levels generated by area traffic that exceed applicable noise standards. Traffic noise along the bordering segments of I-5, SR 70/99, Elkhorn Boulevard, Lone Tree Road, and on-site Meister Way is estimated to exceed the City's 60 dBA $L_{dn}$ /CNEL exterior noise standard in backyards of single-family homes proposed by the project. Also, the interiors of residential land uses located along these transportation routes would be exposed to interior noise levels that exceed applicable maximum interior noise level standards established	S	<b>6.3-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> The project shall implement the following measures before the occupancy of any proposed uses in the related impact areas, to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to significant noise associated with surface transportation (Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2006):  a. For noise impact/mitigation area A (see Exhibit 6.3-6), a solid (e.g., earth, concrete, masonry, wood, and other materials) noise barrier shall be constructed of 10 feet in height relative to backyard elevation at the residences located nearest to the southern boundary, stepping down linearly to 6 feet at its northwestern terminus. The wrapped portion of the	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>by the City of Sacramento General Plan. Therefore, exposure of proposed residential land uses to noise generated by traffic would be a significant impact.</p>		<p>barrier along the southeast corner shall also step down to 6 feet in height at its terminus.</p> <p>b. For noise impact/mitigation area B (see Exhibit 6.3-6), the drainage opening shall be shifted to the north by two lots to close the acoustic opening.</p> <p>c. For noise impact/mitigation area C (see Exhibit 6.3-6), the spaces between the residences shall be bridged with solid noise barriers (e.g., earth, concrete, masonry, wood, and other materials) of 6 feet in height, rather than conventional wood privacy fences. Gates constructed for access into the rear yard spaces shall be constructed so as not to create appreciable acoustic leaks (e.g., constructed of solid wood, sealed to prevent sound and be continuous in length and height with minimal gap at the ground).</p> <p>d. For noise impact/mitigation area D (see Exhibit 6.3-6), all identified side-on residences shall be reoriented so that they face the roadways and the backyard spaces would be shielded by the residences. Following the reorienting of the side-on residences, the side space adjacent to the residences shall be bridged in same manner as specified above under c. Furthermore, the side yard privacy fences at end lots shall be replaced with solid noise barriers (e.g., earth, concrete, masonry, wood, and other materials) 7 feet in height to adequately shield backyard spaces.</p> <p>e. For noise impact/mitigation area E (see Exhibit 6.3-6), it would not be feasible to utilize the types of noise mitigation described above (e.g., walls between individual units), to achieve satisfaction with City noise standards due to the orientation and shape of the residences. As a result, a solid barrier (e.g., earth, concrete, masonry, wood, and other materials) consisting of a berm, a wall, or combination thereof, shall be constructed at the approximate location</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>shown in Exhibit 6.3-6. The barrier shall be 10 feet in height relative to pad elevations of the residences behind the barrier.</p> <p>f. For noise impact/mitigation area F (see Exhibit 6.3-6), a solid noise barrier of 8 feet in height shall be constructed to adequately shield Meister Way traffic noise. In addition, because no discrete outdoor activity areas are identified with the higher density residential developments on the north and south sides of Meister Way near the eastern portion of the site, a solid barrier shall be constructed along both sides of Meister Way at these locations (see exhibit 6.3-6). Where Meister Way becomes elevated at the portion heading east over Highway 99, the barrier shall extend along the top of the cut (at the roadway elevation), to provide efficient shielding to the residences below.</p> <p>g. For noise impact/mitigation area H (see Exhibit 6.3-6), a solid noise barrier or berm/wall combination of 12 feet in height shall be constructed along Elkhorn Boulevard to adequately shield residences which back up to this roadway. In addition, because no discrete outdoor activity areas are identified with the higher density residential developments on the south side of Elkhorn at the northeast corner of the project site, a solid noise barrier or berm/wall combination of 12 feet in height shall be constructed along Elkhorn boulevard at these locations (see Exhibit 6.3-6). The barriers shall be extended inward along the project site access roads.</p> <p>h. For noise impact/mitigation area I (see Exhibit 6.3-6), a solid noise barrier of 6 feet in height shall be constructed along Lone Tree Road to adequately shield residences which back up to the canal east of and adjacent to this roadway.</p> <p>i. Prior to issuance of any building permits, site-specific acoustical analyses shall be conducted once construction plans are available for residential developments located with the 60 dBA <math>L_{dn}</math> contours (see Exhibit 6.3-5) to ensure</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>satisfaction with the City of Sacramento interior noise level standards. The acoustical analyses shall evaluate exposure of proposed noise-sensitive receptors to noise generated by surface transportation sources, in accordance with adopted City of Sacramento interior noise standards (Table 6.3-8). These site-specific acoustical analyses shall also include site-specific design requirements to reduce noise exposure of proposed on-site receptors and all feasible design requirements shall be implemented into the final site design. Noise reduction measures and design features may include, but are not limited to the use of increased noise-attenuation measures in building construction (e.g., dual-pane, sound-rated windows; mechanical air systems; and exterior wall insulation). Given the predicted future traffic noise environment at the exterior facades of the residences nearest to Highway 99 and Interstate5, upgrades to windows will likely be required at many residences, as well as the use of stucco siding or the acoustic equivalent. Implementation of these design measures would ensure interior noise levels meet the City’s noise standards.</p>	
<p><b>6.3-5: Land Use Compatibility of Proposed Residences and School with On-site Aircraft SENL Noise Levels.</b> Exposure of the project site to SENLs generated by aircraft overflights could result in substantial annoyance to on-site sensitive receptors in the forms of speech interference and sleep disruption. Sleep disruption would be infrequent, and an overflight easement disclosing that the project would be subject to sleep and speech disruption would be required. This is a less-than-significant impact. However, students could be exposed to noise generated by aircraft overflights that would result in speech and classroom disruption; this would be a significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.3-5. (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. Prior to issuance of any building permits, site-specific acoustical analyses shall be conducted once construction plans are available for the proposed school to ensure satisfaction with the City of Sacramento interior noise level standards. This site-specific acoustical analyses shall include site-specific design requirements to reduce noise exposure of proposed on-site receptors and all feasible design requirements shall be implemented into the final site design. Noise reduction measures and design features may include, but are not limited to the use of increased noise-attenuation measures in building construction (e.g., dual-pane, sound-rated windows; mechanical air systems; and exterior wall</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		insulation). Implementation of these design measures would ensure interior noise levels meet the City’s noise standards and ANSI standard.	
<b>6.4 Utilities</b>			
<p><b>6.4-1: Increased Demand for Water Supply and Facilities.</b> Water demands for the project would be met by the City of Sacramento through existing water supply entitlements available from the American River, Sacramento River, and the City’s local groundwater well system. The City has sufficient water supplies to meet their existing and projected future demands in addition to the proposed project through 2030 under all water year types (e.g., normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years). Further, other than construction of the necessary infrastructure to connect the project site to the City’s existing water system, no additional water supply facilities would be needed to serve the project. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact related to water supply.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.4-2: Increased Demand for Water Conveyance.</b> Water supply infrastructure is not currently available on the project site; therefore, water line extensions would be required to deliver water to the project site. Proposed water supply facilities would be sized to accommodate the project’s water distribution and fire flow needs. Further, sufficient capacity is available within the city’s off-site water distribution facilities to serve the project site. For these reasons, the provision of water to the project would result in less-than-significant water conveyance impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.4-3: Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection and Conveyance.</b> Sufficient capacity within the SRCSD interceptor system would be available to accommodate the project’s wastewater demand. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.4-4: Environmental Impacts Associated with SRWTP Expansion.</b> The SRWTP would provide wastewater treatment services for the project. The SRWTP is currently undergoing expansion to accommodate wastewater treatment demands for future growth and development. As a result, the project would contribute to the need to expand the SRWTP. According to the EIR prepared for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion, construction and operation of facility improvements could contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction-related air quality. Because the project would contribute to the need for expanding the SRWTP, and would contribute to the impacts assessed in the EIR for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion would be a significant impact to wastewater facilities.</p>	S	<p><b>6.4-4: (City of Sacramento)</b> The environmental impacts of expanding the SRWTP were appropriately evaluated in the EIR for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion Project. All available mitigation was recommended to reduce the environmental impacts of this project where feasible. However, the EIR concluded that even with recommended mitigation, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to construction-related air quality, the cumulative effects of which are discussed in Section 7.2, “Cumulative Impacts,” of this Draft EIR. As such, the project would contribute to this significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	SU
<p><b>6.4-5: Increased Demand for Storm Drainage.</b> The project would increase the volume of stormwater generated at the project site. However, RD 1000’s plant #3 does not have sufficient pumping capacity to pump stormwater generated from the project site. Therefore, development of the project would result in significant impact related to storm drainage.</p>	S	<p><b>6.4-5: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> The project applicant shall fully fund the installation of a new pump that would increase pumping capacity at the RD 1000’s plant #3 by 75 cubic feet per second.</p>	LTS
<p><b>6.4-6: Increased Demand for Electric and Natural Gas Services.</b> The project area would be supplied with energy services by PG&amp;E (i.e., natural gas) and SMUD (i.e., electricity). Energy services are currently being provided adjacent to the project site to the east and south and extension of these services to the site would not cause any physical disturbances beyond that already anticipated at the project site. For these reasons, the provision of energy services to the project site would result in less-than-significant impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
6.5 Public Services			
<p><b>6.5-1: Increased Demand for Fire and Emergency Medical Services.</b> Although SFD is planning to construct a new fire station near the project site and with this facility SFD would provide services to the project site within acceptable standards, the timing of the construction of this facility is currently unknown. Because it is unknown whether adequate fire protection facilities would be in place at the time the first occupancy permit is issued, the project could result in residents living in an area where inadequate fire and emergency response services are provided. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.5-1: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall coordinate with the City of Sacramento and SFD to determine the timing of construction of a new fire station that would serve the proposed project. The project applicant shall enter into an agreement with SFD to ensure that adequate fire protection services would be in place before the issuance of the project’s first occupancy permit. Potential options for adequate services could include construction of a new fire station or an agreement for temporary dedicated services to serve the project site.</p> <p>b. The project’s Finance Plan shall identify necessary public facility improvements needed to serve the project, 100% of the costs required, and all the project’s fair-share costs associated with provision of these facilities and services. The project applicant shall pay into a fee program, as established by the Greenbriar Finance Plan that identifies the funding necessary to construct needed public facilities (e.g., police, fire, water, wastewater, library, and schools). The Draft Greenbriar Finance Plan is provided in Appendix C. The Finance Plan would be structured to ensure that adequate public facilities are in place as development occurs.</p> <p>This mitigation would reduce the project’s fire service impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, construction of anew fire station could result significant and unavoidable construction and operation impacts for which no feasible mitigation is available. As such, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.5-2: Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services.</b> Although the project would increase demand for police personnel, the SPD has indicated that it could serve the project site, without the need to construct any new law enforcement facilities (McCray, pers. comm., 2005). Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on police services.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.5-3: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Disposal Services.</b> Additional solid waste facilities would not be required with development of the proposed project. Therefore, there are no impacts related to provision of adequate solid waste collection and disposal services.</p>	NI	No mitigation measures are required.	NI
<p><b>6.5-4: Increased Demand for School Services.</b> School facilities currently serving the Natomas area, including the proposed elementary school site at the project site, would provide adequate school services to the project site. No additional facilities would be required. In addition, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to Grant Union and Rio Linda Union school districts equal to \$2.24 per square foot for residential development and \$0.36 per square foot for commercial development. (Pollock, pers. comm., 2005) Payment of the development impact fees would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts. As a result, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to school services.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.5-5: Increased Demand for Library Services.</b> The existing library located at 2500 New Market Drive would provide library services to the project. In addition, a new library is planned to be built next to Inderkum High School when funding is available. The project applicant would pay into a fee program that would contribute to the funding of this facility. No additional library facilities would be required to serve the project. Therefore, no impacts related to library services would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation measures are required.	NI

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.6 Parks and Open Space</b>			
<p><b>6.6-1: Increased Demand for City Neighborhood and Community Parks.</b> A prescribed formula in the City’s Quimby Act land dedication ordinance is used to determine how much parkland must be provided by proposed developments to meet demand generated by new residents. Based on application of this formula, residential development under the proposed project would require 48.2 net acres of parks. The proposed project would provide approximately 48.4 net acres of neighborhood and community parks. Therefore, the proposed project would provide sufficient parkland to meet the City’s standards for parkland dedication, and thus would provide sufficient park facilities to meet demand. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<p><b>6.6-2: Substantial Loss of Open Space Resources.</b> The proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 577 acres of agricultural land to nonagricultural use in an area that already is experiencing substantial development and loss of open space. The conversion of agricultural land to urban development would result in the permanent loss of open space resources. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.6-2: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. Consistent with the principles of the City/County Joint Vision Plan, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City to identify appropriate lands to be set aside in a permanent conservation easements at a ratio of one open space acre converted to urban land uses to one-half open space acre preserved and at a ratio of one habitat acre converted to urban land uses to one-half habitat acre preserved. The total acres of land conserved shall be based on final site maps indicating the total on-site open space and habitat converted. Conserved open space and habitat areas could include areas on the project site, lands secured for permanent habitat enhancement (e.g., giant garter snake, Swainson’s hawk habitat), or additional land identified by applicant in consultation with the City. All conserved open space and habitat land shall be located in the NNJV area. Should the City and County change adopted mitigation ratios</p>	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		before issuance of any grading permits, the project applicant shall comply with the revised policy.  <b>LAFCo</b> Prior to annexation, the city shall implement mitigation measure 6.6-2.  Implementation of the above mitigation would substantially lessen the projects open space resources impacts; however, this mitigation would only partially offset the project’s impacts. No other feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact.	
<b>6.7 Aesthetics</b>			
<b>6.7-1: Impacts on Scenic Vistas.</b> Views on or near the project site are not considered scenic vistas. Therefore, development of the project site would not alter or obscure a scenic vista. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS
<b>6.7-2: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway.</b> The project site is not visible from a state scenic highway and would not damage scenic resources. The project would result in no impacts to scenic resources within a scenic highway.	NI	No mitigation measures are required.	NI
<b>6.7-3: Degradation of Visual Character.</b> The visual character of the Natomas Basin has been gradually changing from agricultural to suburban development as development proceeds north in Sacramento. The project would convert a large area of land from visual open space to suburban development. This is a significant impact to the visual character of the area.	S	<b>6.7-3: (City of Sacramento)</b> Because of the scale and location of the project, there is no feasible mitigation available to address aesthetic resource impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land to urban development. Although design, architectural, development, and landscaping standards through the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) Guidelines would provide an urban development on the project site that remains within certain aesthetic guidelines, there is no mechanism to allow implementation of the project while avoiding the conversion of the local viewshed from agricultural to urban development. Impacts related to the degradation of the local viewshed through	SU

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		conversion of agricultural lands to urban development are considered significant and unavoidable.	
<p><b>6.7-4: Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces.</b> The project would require lighting of new development and could construct facilities with reflective surfaces that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on I-5 and SR 70/99 under day and nighttime conditions. In addition, the degree of darkness in the City of Sacramento and on the project site would diminish as a result of development. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.7-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall install light fixtures that have light sources aimed downwards and install shielded lighting outside to prevent glare or reflection or any nuisance, inconvenience, and hazardous interference of any kind on adjoining streets or property.</p> <p>b. The project applicant shall adhere to all requirements of the City of Sacramento design guidelines regarding appropriate building materials, lighting, and signage in the office/commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists and adjacent land uses. All proposed development plans shall be approved by the City.</p>	LTS
6.8 Public Health and Hazards			
<p><b>6.8-1: Potential for Health Hazards Caused by Contaminated Soil.</b> Although the project site has historically been used for agricultural purposes and there is the potential that soil on the site has been contaminated by the on-site use of agricultural pesticides, chemicals used on the project site are not considered to be persistent in the soil, and no evidence of high concentrations of pesticides in on-site soils was found. The potential for health hazards associated with past use of pesticides at the project site would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p><b>6.8-2: Potential for Health Hazards from Soils Contaminated by Previously Unknown USTs or by Other Sources at Former Two Jakes Park Site.</b> According to the Phase 1 ESA performed for the project site, there are no registered USTs, ASTs, or records of hazardous materials on-site, and no evidence of soil contamination was found at the horse training facility, Two Jakes Park. However, unknown USTs could be discovered during construction, potentially</p>	PS	<p><b>6.8-2: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>In the event of discovery of an undocumented or unknown UST or residual soil contamination (e.g., stained or odiferous soil) on the project site, construction activities adjacent to the UST or in the area of the soil contamination shall cease and the County EMD shall be contacted immediately. Any USTs discovered during construction shall be removed and any contaminated soils shall be excavated and treated according to County EMD</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>resulting in exposure to contaminated soils. While no soil contamination was immediately evident during a June 2005 site visit, the scope of the examination was limited. Search of an EPA database by EDAW revealed no contamination, but it is possible that some residual soil contamination could be present on the former site of Two Jakes Park, resulting in the potential for exposure of construction workers to associated health hazards. For these reasons, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>		<p>procedures before the resumption of construction.</p>	
<p><b>6.8-3: Potential for Safety Hazards from Proximity of Airport to Proposed Land Uses.</b> The project’s residential land uses would be compatible with safety standards outlined in the Sacramento International Airport CLUP. However, the proposed parks and light rail station located within the overflight zone (a safety zone of the Sacramento International Airport) could result in densities that exceed 50 persons per acre at any one time, which would exceed density standards allowed by CLUP. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<p><b>6.8-3: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. Prior to City pre-zoning and prior to annexation, the City shall request a consistency determination of proposed land use with the CLUP from Sacramento County ALUC. The consistency determination shall describe the specific land uses that would be allowable and consistent with the CLUP in accordance with ALUC standards.</p> <p>b. Prior to City pre-zoning and prior to annexation, if the consistency determination by ALUC comes to the conclusion that certain proposed land uses would be inconsistent with the CLUP the City shall review the decision of the ALUC and determine whether to override the ALUC’s decision. The City shall submit its notice to override the consistency to the ALUC for review before approving the override.</p> <p>There is no other feasible mitigation to bring the project in compliance with CLUP standards. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p align="center">SU</p>
<p><b>6.8-4: Potential for Airspace Safety Hazards Associated with Project Water Feature.</b> The proposed project would include an on-site lake/detention basin, which could attract large numbers of birds, thereby potentially creating a flyway between the site and the Sacramento River and interfering with existing aircraft flight routes. Birds are recognized by the Sacramento International Airport CLUP as a potential hazard</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<p><b>6.8-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. To ensure that the final location and design of the lake/detention basin is consistent with the recommendations of the ALUC regarding wildlife hazards to aviation, the project applicant shall prepare a design and management plan for this proposed water feature. This plan shall be prepared in coordination with the Sacramento International Airport</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>to aircraft because of the remote potential for high-speed collisions with birds, as well as the ingestion of birds into aircraft engines. This impact would be significant.</p>		<p>Operations Manager before commencement of construction. The plan shall determine an appropriate size for the lake/detention basin and incorporate specific design measures deemed sufficient by SCAS and the ALUC to minimize bird strikes and other wildlife-related airspace safety hazards in the vicinity of the project area. The plan shall include information sufficient to satisfy requirements for preparation of a Wildlife Hazard Management Plan and shall be prepared by a qualified wildlife hazard damage biologist. The project applicant shall submit a detailed design drawing of the proposed lake/detention basin to SCAS for review.</p> <p>b. To reduce bird attractants associated with the lake/detention basin, the Wildlife Hazards Management Plan for the lake/detention basin and surrounding landscape shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To minimize growth of aquatic vegetation that attracts waterfowl, the lake shall be sufficiently deep to prevent growth of cattails and other aquatic plants. Lake edges shall be lined and maintained to prevent vegetation growth;</li> <li>ii. Concrete bulkheads approximately 1 to 2 feet high shall be constructed along the lake's perimeter. A detailed description of the design of the bank edge shall be submitted to SCAS for review;</li> <li>iii. Any vegetation planted in the vicinity of the lake shall consist of plant species that do not provide birds with opportunities for cover, nesting, perching, or feeding. A detailed design plan for landscaping surrounding the lake/detention basin shall be submitted to SCAS for review;</li> <li>iv. Barriers (e.g., walls, fences) shall be constructed a minimum of 48 inches high and be located between the lake and nearby grassy areas to dissuade geese or other</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>waterfowl from walking to the lake.</p> <p>v. Signs shall be placed at regular intervals around the perimeter of the lake prohibiting the public from feeding birds. The project proponent shall maintain such signs in good order and replace such signs as necessary. This responsibility shall transfer to the Homeowner’s Association (HOA) and shall be articulated in the covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&amp;Rs).</p> <p>vi. Trash receptacles with covers shall be placed at regular intervals around the lake and be designed to prevent access to refuse by birds. The CC&amp;Rs shall specify that the project proponent and HOA shall be responsible for ensuring trash receptacles with covers are provided and properly emptied on a regular basis and replaced as necessary.</p> <p>vii. Installation of structures near the lake that could serve as perches for gulls and other birds shall be minimized. The CC&amp;Rs shall prohibit the future installation of such structures.</p> <p>viii. The project applicant shall prohibit all activities and uses that could conflict with implementation of the wildlife hazard management program.</p> <p>c. An Adaptive Management Plan shall be prepared and incorporated into the Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. The Adaptive Management Plan shall provide for the long-term management of nuisance birds around the lake. The management plan shall involve perpetual monitoring and employment of various techniques for controlling birds using adaptive information and bird control products. The Homeowner’s Association shall be responsible for ensuring the implementation and continued enforcement of the Adaptive Management Plan and provision of adequate funding. This requirement shall be specified in the CC&amp;Rs.</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The Adaptive Management Plan shall include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Bird control program that involves use of the most efficient and effective bird control techniques available that are practicable and compatible with surrounding land uses and recreational uses of the lake,</li> <li>ii. Monitoring program that involves patrolling of the lake and assessment of the effectiveness of bird control measures, the presence of potential bird attractants, and the need for modifying or increasing bird control measures,</li> <li>iii. Funding mechanism such as use of an endowment fund or assessment district to fund the long-term monitoring and adaptive management program.</li> <li>iv. Any use of the lake that conflicts with the wildlife control program shall be prohibited.</li> <li>d. The Adaptive Management Plan shall include the best available information on various bird control techniques, an explanation of the situations in which various techniques are best employed, and instructions for implementing such techniques. The entity responsible for implementing the management plan shall employ a qualified and experienced Wildlife Damage Biologist/Manager (Manager) who shall be responsible for determining which bird control techniques to implement based on information provided in the management plan and the best scientific and commercial information available. The Manager shall be trained in bird control techniques by the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Wildlife Services (USDA). The initial cost of such training shall be borne by the project proponent. The cost of subsequent training shall be borne by the HOA. The Manager shall have the discretion to use new technologies or information regarding bird control provided they are practicable and</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>within the management budget, and do not conflict with surrounding land uses or the recreational and flood control functions of the lake.</p> <p>e. The monitoring and maintenance portion of the Adaptive Management Plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. patrol to ensure the lake area is kept clean and free of refuse and other such material that may attract birds;</li> <li>ii. patrol to ensure the public is abiding by rules prohibiting feeding of birds;</li> <li>iii. control of vegetative growth around the lake to minimize any vegetation that would attract birds for purpose of cover, nesting, perching, or food;</li> <li>iv. remove all nesting material prior to completion of nest if any birds attempt to nest in areas surrounding the lake. All nest removal activities must comply with provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the federal Endangered Species Act;</li> <li>v. inspect the lake area to determine whether additional measures are needed to reduce bird use of the lake; and</li> <li>vi. aggressively haze wildlife to discourage use of the lake.</li> </ul> <p>f. If monitoring efforts reveal that additional control efforts are necessary, the Bird Control Program Manager may implement one or more control techniques outlined in the Adaptive Management Plan, or other techniques based on best available scientific and commercial information. Bird control techniques currently being used at airports, on agricultural lands, and in other areas where birds pose a hazard or nuisance shall be described in the Adaptive Management Plan. The Bird Control Program Manager shall have discretion of using any one or more of the techniques based on the need, practicability, and land use compatibility. These techniques may include, but are not limited to:</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Allowing grass to grow over 20 centimeters in height (currently being employed at some airports).</li> <li>g. In addition to these control techniques, the Adaptive Management Plan shall outline an education program for the Homeowner’s Association to implement ensuring that the public is aware of the importance of eliminating bird attractants from the area around the lake. The public shall be prohibitive from feeding birds around the lake and engaging in any other activities within the boundaries of the development project which may attract wildlife hazards to aircraft operations. The public shall be made aware of the purpose and importance of various bird control measures being implemented by the Bird Control Program Manager.</li> <li>h. Prohibited Uses of Lake: all activities and uses of the lake/detention basin that may conflict with the wildlife control program shall be expressly prohibited.</li> <li>i. Post signs prohibiting swimming in the lake/detention basin.</li> <li>j. Review by Sacramento County Airport System: If the SCAS determines that conditions in the Greenbriar/ Arbor Landing Development are not consistent with the above listed Management Program, SCAS may take the following actions:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. notify the property owner that the wildlife control measures are out of compliance;</li> <li>ii. that the County Airport System may, at its option, initiate control measures at the site, with the costs of such measures billed to the owner; and</li> <li>iii. in the event of an immediate threat to aircraft safety, County Airport System personnel can take immediate action to remedy the air hazard emergency.</li> </ul> </li> <li>k. To reduce attractants for Canada geese, American coots, or gulls associated with the lake/detention basin and</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		surrounding landscape the Management Plan shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Signs shall be posted and identify that feeding birds is prohibited.</li> <li>ii. A 30-foot barrier strip of tall grass (6 inches or more) adjacent to the lakeshore; or a fence or other barrier (e.g., dense hedges) shall be constructed between the lakeshore and surrounding grasslands.</li> <li>iii. Any nest building activity associated with birds shall be removed including all nesting materials.</li> <li>l. To prevent the establishment of resident populations of Canada geese on the project site, the Bird Control Program Manager shall take the following, but not limited to, actions:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Chase birds from site,</li> <li>ii. Use of noise generators (e.g., pyrotechnic devices, blank cartridges),</li> <li>iii. Use of visual devices (e.g., flags, scarecrows, water sprays)</li> <li>iv. Use of chase dogs,</li> <li>v. Live trapping or netting, and/or</li> <li>vi. Use of chemical repellants.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>6.8-5: Interference with an Adopted Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan.</b> Development of the proposed project would not interfere with emergency plans. Sufficient ingress and egress routes would be provided to ensure public safety in the event of an emergency. Moreover, residential areas for the proposed project would be designed in a grid street pattern, which would reduce the potential for adverse effects on access to the site by emergency service vehicles. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.8-6: Potential for Public Health Hazards from Mosquitoes Associated with Project Water Feature.</b> The proposed project would include an on-site lake/detention basin, which could attract mosquitoes and other water-borne vectors, thereby potentially creating a public health hazard. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>6.8-6 (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. To ensure that operation and design of the lake/detention basin is consistent with the recommendations of the MVCD regarding mosquito control, the project applicant shall prepare a Vector Control Plan. This plan shall be prepared in coordination with the MVCD and shall be submitted to the MVCD for approval before issuance of the grading permit for the lake/detention basin. The plan shall incorporate specific measures deemed sufficient by MVCD to minimize public health risks from mosquitoes. The plan shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Description of the project</li> <li>2. Description of lake/detention basin and all facilities that would control on-site water levels</li> <li>3. Goals of the plan</li> <li>4. Description of the water management elements and features that would be implemented:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Best management practices that would implemented on-site</li> <li>b. Public education and awareness</li> <li>c. Sanitary methods used (e.g., disposal of garbage)</li> <li>d. Mosquito control methods used (e.g., fluctuating water levels, biological agents, pesticides, larvacides, circulating water)</li> <li>e. Stormwater management (consistent with Stormwater Management Plan)</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Long-term maintenance of the lake/detention basin and all related facilities (e.g., specific ongoing enforceable conditions or maintenance by a homeowner’s association)</li> </ol> <p>b. To reduce the potential for mosquitoes to reproduce in the lake/detention basin, the project applicant shall coordinate</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		with the MVCD to identify and implement BMPs based on their potential effectiveness for project site conditions. Potential BMPs that the applicant could implement include, but not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Stock the lake/detention basin with mosquito fish, guppies, backswimmers, flatworms, and/or other invertebrate predators.</li> <li>▶ Maintain a stable water level the lake/detention basin to reduce water level fluctuation resulting from evaporation, transpiration, outflow, and seepage.</li> </ul>	
<b>6.9 Geology and Soils</b>			
<p><b>6.9-1: Risks to People and Structures Caused by Seismic Hazards, Including Strong Ground Shaking and Liquefaction.</b> The project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone. Surface rupture from faulting is therefore not expected to occur on the project site. However, the project site is located in an area considered by the California Geological Survey to be a relatively moderate ground shaking zone. Ground shaking, as a result of seismic activity from nearby or distant earthquake faults, could cause seismic-related ground failure. The water-saturated alluvial soils occurring on the project site are considered to possess low strength and could potentially liquefy during a seismic event. Thus, development of the project site with homes and other structures has the potential to expose people to substantial adverse effects from seismic hazards, including ground shaking and liquefaction. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.9-1: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Before issuance of a grading permit, a geotechnical report shall be prepared by a qualified geotechnical engineer. This report shall be completed to assess the extent to which the recommendations are appropriate and sufficient for construction of the buildings described in the final project design plans. The geotechnical engineer shall prepare a comprehensive site-specific geotechnical report with specific design recommendations sufficient to ensure the safety of soil conditions (e.g., percent subsidence/expansive soils impacts), project structures, and site occupants.</li> <li>b. All water supply and wastewater pipelines shall be designed per City standards to minimize the potential for damage in the event of strong ground shaking and potential liquefaction.</li> <li>c. During project design and construction, all measures outlined in the preliminary geotechnical report for the project (Wallace Kuhl &amp; Associates 2002) as well as specific design measures included in the geotechnical report shall be implemented, at the direction of the City engineer, to prevent significant impacts associated with seismic</li> </ol>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>activity. A geotechnical engineer shall be present on-site during earthmoving activities to ensure that requirements outlined in the geotechnical reports are adhered to for proper fill and compaction of soils.</p> <p>d. Should the construction schedule require continued work during the wet weather months (e.g., October through April), the project applicant shall consult with a qualified civil engineer and implement any additional recommendations provided, as conditions warrant. These recommendations would include but not be limited to (1) allowing a prolonged drying period before attempting grading operations at any time after the onset of winter rains; and (2) implementing aeration or lime treatment, to allow any low-permeability surface clay soils intended for use as engineered fill to reach a moisture content that would permit the specified degree of compaction to be achieved (Wallace Kuhl &amp; Associates 2002; Perry, pers. comm., 2005).</p>	
<p><b>6.9-2: Construction-Related Erosion Hazards.</b> Excavation and grading of soil could result in localized erosion during project construction. Further, dewatering may be required during some excavation activities as a result of high groundwater levels, which could increase the potential for construction-related erosion. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p align="center">PS</p>	<p><b>6.9-2: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <p>a. A grading and erosion control plan shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer and submitted to the City of Sacramento Department of Public Works for approval prior to issuance of the first building permits. The plan shall be consistent with the California Building Standards Code grading requirements and shall identify the site-specific grading to be used for new development. All grading shall be balanced on-site, where feasible.</p> <p>b. To ensure soils do not directly or indirectly discharge sediments into surface waters as a result of construction activities, the project applicant shall develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as discussed in Section 6.10, "Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality." The SWPPP shall identify Best Management Practices that</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		would be used to protect stormwater runoff and minimize erosion during construction. The project applicant shall prepare plans to control erosion and sediment, shall prepare preliminary and final grading plans, and shall prepare plans to control urban runoff from the project site during construction, in compliance with the City of Sacramento Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.	
<b>6.9-3: Potential for Subsidence or Compression of Unstable Soils.</b> Although the project site is not located in a known subsidence area as denoted by the County General Plan, it is located on soils that exhibit the potential to subside because of their high shrink-swell potential and low strength. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	<b>6.9-3: (City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.9-1, described above, to reduce the risks to people and structures from subsidence or compression of unstable soils at the project site.	LTS
<b>6.9-4: Potential for Damage Associated with Expansive Soils.</b> Soils on portions of the project site are moderately susceptible to expansive soil behavior. Expansive soils may cause differential and cyclical foundation movements that can cause damage and/or distress to overlying structures. In addition, the groundwater table is shallow, which enhances the potential for shrink and swell. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	<b>6.9-4: (City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.9-1, described above, to reduce the potential for damage associated with expansive soils.	LTS
<b>6.10 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>6.10-1: Construction-related and Operational Water Quality and Erosion Impacts.</b> Operation of the project would not result in any water quality or erosion impacts because the project would implement design features that would be consistent with the City of Sacramento Stormwater Quality Standards for Development Projects. However, project construction activities (grading, excavation, etc.) could generate sediment, erosion, and other nonpoint source pollutants in on-site stormwater, which could drain to off-site areas degrading local water quality. Further, on-site earthmoving and soil stockpiling activities could result in sheet	PS	<b>6.10-1: (City of Sacramento)</b> a. The project applicant shall demonstrate compliance through its grading plans with all requirements of the City’s Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Title 15, Chapter 15.88 of the City Code) including preparing erosion, sediment, and pollution control plans for each construction phase and postconstruction, if necessary. The project’s grading plans shall be approved by the City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities. b. The project applicant shall demonstrate compliance through	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>erosion during rain events. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>its grading plans with all requirements of the City’s Stormwater Management and Control Code (Chapter 13.16 of the City Code), which regulates stormwater and prohibits nonstormwater discharges except where regulated by an NPDES permit. The project applicant shall implement measures including the use of soil stabilizers, fiber rolls, inlet filters, and gravel bags to prevent pollutants from being carried off-site in stormwater generated on the project site. These measures shall be designed to accommodate stormwater discharges associated with proposed measures that would be implemented to control on-site dust generation (e.g., wheel washing, active watering).</p> <p>c. The project applicant shall consult with the Central Valley RWQCB to acquire the appropriate regulatory approvals that may be necessary to obtain Section 401 water quality certification, SWRCB statewide NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, Central Valley RWQCB NPDES permit for construction dewatering activity, and any other necessary site-specific waste discharge requirements.</p> <p>d. As required under the NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, the project applicant shall prepare and submit the appropriate Notice of Intent and prepare the SWPPP and other necessary engineering plans and specifications for pollution prevention and control. The SWPPP and other appropriate plans shall identify and specify the use of erosion sediment control BMPs, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, nonstormwater management controls, permanent post-construction BMPs, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities. The SWPPP would also specify the pollutants that are likely to be used during construction and that could be present in stormwater drainage and nonstormwater discharges. A sampling and monitoring program shall be included in the SWPPP that meets the</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>requirements of SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ to ensure the BMPs are effective.</p> <p>e. Construction techniques shall be identified that would reduce the potential runoff, and the plan shall identify the erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented. The SWPPP shall also specify spill prevention and contingency measures, identify the types of materials used for equipment operation, and identify measures to prevent or clean up spills of hazardous materials used for equipment operation and hazardous waste. Emergency procedures for responding to spills shall also be identified. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be used in subsequent site development activities. The SWPPP shall identify personnel training requirements and procedures that would be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation and performance inspection methods for BMPs specified in SWPPP. The SWPPP shall also identify the appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP. All construction contractors shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site.</p> <p>f. The project applicant shall prepare and submit a Notice of Intent and acquire authorization for a Central Valley RWQCB NPDES permit for construction dewatering activities that may be necessary for foundation and utility installations within the project site.</p>	
<p><b>6.10-2: Potential Exceedance of Drainage System Capacity.</b> The proposed project includes a lake/detention basin component that has been sized to meet the stormwater drainage needs of the project. Proposed stormwater discharges would exceed the pumping capacity of RD 1000's drainage network. However, improvements to RD 1000's pumping capacity have been required by this DEIR which would</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
increase RD 1000's pumping capacity sufficiently to serve project generated stormwater drainage. (See Mitigation Measure 6.5-5) Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.			
<b>6.10-3: On-Site Flooding Risk from Potential for Levee or Dam Failure.</b> The project site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain as currently delineated by FEMA. Because the project site is currently certified for 100-year flood protection, the project would result in less-than-significant flooding impacts.	LTS	<b>6.10-3: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> Although the project would result in less-than-significant flooding impacts, the applicant has agreed to implement the following mitigation to further ensure that adequate flood protection would be provided at the project site. a. In the event that levees currently providing adequate flood protection to the project site are decertified and can no longer provide 100-year flood protection as determined by FEMA, the applicant shall implement one of the following mitigation measures. This mitigation measure shall terminate upon the first recertification of the levees by FEMA. b. Raise the building pads of all buildings with the project to a level high enough to remove structures from the 100-year floodplain as identified by FEMA in any such decertification; or c. Participate in a funding mechanism established for the purpose of implementing measures that would provide no less than 100-year flood protection for the project site, or for that portion of the Natomas Basing requiring re-certification for 100-year flood protection including the project site provided that such funding mechanism is (1) based on a nexus study; (2) is regional in nature; and (3) is proportionate, fair, and equitable; and (4) complies with all applicable laws and ordinances.	LTS
<b>6.10-4: Result in an On-site Flooding Hazard.</b> Project implementation would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site and would increase surface runoff and the need for discharge to the West Drainage Canal. However, the	LTS	<b>6.10-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> Although the project would result in less-than-significant flooding impacts, the applicant has agreed to implement the	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>proposed project includes a stormwater runoff collection system sufficient to protect the project site during a 24-hour and 10-day 100-year flood event and avoid increases in off-site flooding. Therefore, development of the project site would not result in an on-site flooding hazard. This impact would be less than significant.</p>		<p>following mitigation to further ensure that adequate flood protection would be provided at the project site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project applicant shall submit grading plans to the City Department of Utilities that demonstrate that Elkhorn Boulevard has been sufficiently raised to provide 1 foot of freeboard above Lone Tree Canal during a 100-year storm event. Approximately 1,800 linear feet of Elkhorn Boulevard would need to be raised to provide sufficient localized flood protection.</li> <li>b. The project applicant shall submit drainage and infrastructure plans to the City Department of Utilities that provide for the installation of a 48-inch culvert in Lone Tree Canal at Elkhorn Boulevard. Construction of this improvement could result in impacts to riparian and other native habitat; impacts to biological resources including giant garter snake habitat, and construction-related air quality (NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>), noise, transportation, and stormwater quality impacts. These impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation recommended for the project and presented in this Draft EIR. As a result, no new significant environmental impacts would occur with implementation of this improvement.</li> </ul>	
<b>6.11 Agriculture</b>			
<p><b>6.11-1: Conversion of Important Farmlands.</b> The project would result in the conversion of 518 acres of important farmlands to urban land uses. Conversion of important farmland to nonagricultural use would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p><b>6.11-1: (City of Sacramento)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.6-2.</li> </ul> <p><b>LAFCo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Prior to annexation the applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.6-2.</li> </ul>	SU
<p><b>6.11-2: Conflict with Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts.</b> The project site is currently not under a Williamson Act contract but the project site is currently zoned</p>	NI	No mitigation measures are required.	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
for agricultural land uses. The project would rezone the site from an agriculture designation to residential, commercial, and open space designations. Therefore, development of the project site as proposed would not result in any conflicts with Williamson Act contracts or agricultural zoning designations and no impacts would result.			
<b>6.11-3: Conflict with Off-site Agricultural Operations.</b> The project site is located adjacent to agricultural operations to the north and development of the project could result in conflicts between adjacent agricultural activities and proposed residential land uses, which could lead to the abandonment of agricultural operations on lands to the north of the project site and could potentially result in the ultimate conversion of this land to non-agricultural land uses. This would be considered a significant impact.	S	<b>6.11-3: (City of Sacramento)</b> The project applicant shall notify all prospective residents and tenants located within 500 feet of existing agricultural uses north of Elkhorn Boulevard of the types of existing agricultural operations that could occur within close proximity of their homes or businesses. Notification provided to residents and tenants shall include information on the types of land use conflicts that could occur (e.g., noise, dust) and the appropriate means by which to address these conflicts. The City shall approve the content of this notification and this notification shall be included in all residential deed and tenant agreements at the time of sale or lease.  Although this mitigation would notify residents of potential conflicts, it would not remove or reduce potential conflicts. No other feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU
<b>6.12 Biological Resources</b>			
<b>6.12-1: Effects to Giant Garter Snake.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts to 58.75 acres of potential giant garter snake habitat. This impact would include the permanent loss of 55.56 acres of potential giant garter snake habitat and temporary impacts to 3.31 acres of potential giant garter snake habitat. Direct and indirect impacts could include loss of individuals, effects on connectivity, displacement of snakes currently occupying the site, effects related to increased contaminants, predation by domestic and feral animals, effects related to human encroachment, and road	S	<b>6.12-1: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> a. To mitigate impacts to giant garter snake, the project applicant shall prepare an HCP, pursuant to Section 10(a) of ESA, and shall obtain appropriate authorization for incidental take of giant garter snake from USFWS and DFG. (DFG would issue permits through Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code.) The HCP shall include a comprehensive giant garter snake conservation strategy, developed through consultation with USFWS and DFG. This strategy shall be consistent with the goals of the regional basin-wide	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>mortality. These impacts would result in significant adverse effects to giant garter snake.</p>		<p>conservation program described in the NBHCP, and shall advance the NBHCP’s regional conservation strategy. This conservation strategy shall be designed to include avoidance, minimization and compensation measures that are adequate to assure that the proposed project shall not compromise the effectiveness of the NBHCP.</p> <p>b. The conservation strategy shall include habitat preservation and restoration consistent with the NBHCP’s strategy of establishing an interconnected reserve system composed of marshlands, uplands, and rice fields in the Natomas Basin. Key elements of the giant garter snake conservation shall include on-site/off-site habitat preservation, restoration, and creation, and on-site avoidance and minimization measures. The conservation strategy that would ultimately be implemented as mitigation would be developed through consultation with DFG and USFWS as part of the permitting process. Refinements may occur through the USFWS/DFG consultation process, to the extent that the NBHCP regional conservation strategy is advanced.</p> <p><b><i>1. Habitat Creation, Preservation, and Management in the Lone Tree Canal Linear Open Space/ Buffer Area</i></b></p> <p>a. To ensure that the project does not diminish habitat connectivity for giant garter snake between the southwest and northwest zones identified in the NBHCP, approximately 30.6 acres along Lone Tree Canal shall be protected and managed as giant garter snake habitat. This on-site habitat preservation shall protect an approximately 250-foot wide corridor of giant garter snake habitat that includes the canal and approximately 200 feet of adjacent uplands. Uplands within the linear open space/buffer area shall be managed as perennial grassland as described below. Additional aquatic habitat for giant garter snake shall be created along the east bank of Lone Tree Canal by construction and maintenance of a 2.7 acre tule bench. The</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>habitat shall be managed in perpetuity as high-quality habitat for giant garter snake. Compliance and biological effectiveness monitoring shall be performed and annual monitoring reports prepared within six months of completion of monitoring for any given year. This monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management shall be performed as described in Section IV of the NBHCP.</p> <p>b. To ensure that the project does not diminish giant garter snake movement along Lone Tree Canal, all new road crossings of Lone Tree Canal shall be designed to minimize obstacles to giant garter snake movement. The use of culverts under new road crossings on Lone Tree Canal shall be prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that the culverts will not diminish the potential for giant garter snake movement through the section of Lone Tree Canal protected by the setback fence and conservation easement.</p> <p>c. Upland giant garter snake habitat within the Lone Tree Canal linear open space/buffer area shall be created and managed to provide cover, basking areas, and refugia during the winter dormant period. Hibernaculae would be constructed at regular intervals by embedding concrete or coarse rock in the bank or in a berm along the Lone Tree Canal corridor to provide additional winter refugia. Upland habitat with the linear open space/buffer areas shall be converted to native perennial grassland and managed, in perpetuity, as perennial grassland habitat.</p> <p>d. Aquatic habitat shall be maintained throughout the giant garter snake active season in Lone Tree Canal, in perpetuity. This is the legal responsibility and obligation of Metro Air Park property owners (MAP). The MAP HCP includes provisions for maintaining water in the canal such that the basic habitat requirements of the giant garter snake</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>are met. The MAP HCP also provides a road map, through “Changed Circumstances”, to address procedures to follow if water is not being maintained in the canal to meet these requirements. As described in the MAP HCP, the MAP is legally obligated to assure these requirements are met, and financial and procedural mechanisms are included in the MAP HCP to enforce this. It is, therefore, assumed that MAP will provide water to Lone Tree Canal, as required by the MAP HCP and ITP, in perpetuity. It is also assumed that USFWS will use all reasonable means available to it, to enforce this MAP HCP requirement. If water is not provided to Lone Tree Canal by the MAP to meet the habitat requirements of giant garter snake, as required by the MAP HCP, and USFWS exhausts its enforcement responsibilities, the project applicant shall assume the responsibility of providing suitable giant garter snake aquatic habitat throughout the section of Lone Tree Canal protected by the fence and conservation easement. However, as stated herein, the project applicant shall only assume this responsibility if it has been sufficiently demonstrated to the City that USFWS has exhausted all reasonable means to compel MAP to comply with the relevant conditions of the MAP ITP. Specific requirements related to ensuring suitable aquatic habitat in Lone Tree Canal is present, in perpetuity, throughout the giant garter snake active season shall be developed through consultation with DFG and USFWS, and included in the new or amended HCP for Greenbriar, and may include mechanisms, such as installation of a well, to assure water is provided in the canal to meet habitat requirements.</p> <p>e. A barrier shall be installed between the giant garter snake habitat linear open space/buffer area and the adjacent Greenbriar development to ensure that giant garter snakes do not enter the development area, and to prohibit humans</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and pets from entering the giant garter snake habitat. The design of this barrier shall be subject to USFWS and CDFG review and approval. The entire length of the barrier, which shall be bordered by yards rather than roadways, shall be maintained on the preserve side by a nonprofit land trust to ensure that vegetation or debris does not accumulate near the barrier and provide opportunities for wildlife and pets to climb over the barrier. On the development side, Covenants, Codes and Restrictions (CCRs) shall prohibit accumulation of vegetation or debris adjacent to the barrier. Chain link fencing shall be placed at both ends of the corridor, with locked gates permitting entry only by RD 1000 and NMWD for channel maintenance, and by the preserve manager for habitat monitoring and maintenance purposes.</p> <p>f. Specific requirements associated with the barrier shall be developed through consultation with USFWS and DFG, and may include the following and/or other specifications that DFG and USFWS consider to be equally or more effective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Adequate height and below-ground depth to prevent snakes or burrowing mammals from providing a through-route for snakes by establishing burrows from one side to the other crossing;</li> <li>▶ Constructed using extruded concrete or block construction extending a minimum of 36-inches above ground level;</li> <li>▶ Maintenance to repair the barrier and to prevent the establishment of vegetation or collection of debris that could provide snakes with a climbing surface allowing them to breach the barrier;</li> <li>▶ A cap or lip extending at least two-inches beyond the barrier’s vertical edge to prevent snakes from gaining</li> </ul>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>access along the barrier’s top edge; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Signage to discourage humans and their pets from entering the area.</li> </ul> <p>g. The Lone Tree Canal linear open space/buffer area shall be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement and managed to sustain the value of this area for giant garter snake habitat connectivity. Compliance and biological effectiveness monitoring shall be performed and annual monitoring reports prepared. This monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management shall be performed as described in Section IV of the NBHCP or following procedures developed in formal consultation with USFWS and DFG and contained in an ESA Incidental Take Permit for the Greenbriar project.</p> <p><b>2. Off-site Habitat Preservation, Restoration, and Creation</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall preserve, restore, and manage giant garter snake habitat at two off-site locations identified as having high regional conservation value, and contributing to an interconnected regional reserve system as envisioned in the NBHCP. Off-site habitat preservation, restoration, and creation shall be implemented on the Sacramento County portion of the Spangler property (“Spangler Site”) and the Natomas 130 parcel (“Natomas 130 Site”) to ensure that implementation of the proposed project would result in no net loss of overall giant garter snake habitat value. The habitat shall be managed in perpetuity as high-quality habitat for giant garter snake. Compliance and biological effectiveness monitoring shall be performed and annual monitoring reports prepared. This monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management shall be performed as described in Section IV of the NBHCP.</p> <p>The Spangler Site is located in northern Sacramento County along the Sutter County line, northeast of the</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Sacramento Airport and west of SR 70/99 (Exhibit 6.12-4). This site is currently in irrigated rice. It is surrounded by agriculture (primarily rice) on all sides. Existing water channels provide potential habitat connectivity for giant garter snake between the Spangler Site and Lone Tree Canal. A minimum of 190 acres of managed marsh, including 55.2 acres of upland habitat, shall be created and preserved for giant garter snake on the Spangler Site. The 55.2 acres of upland habitat shall also serve as mitigation for impacts to Swainson’s hawk described under Impact 6.12-2. To further reduce impacts to Swainson’s hawk, a minimum 45.4 acres of high-quality Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat (e.g., alfalfa) shall be created and managed on the Spangler Site, as further discussed below.</p> <p>The North Natomas 130 Site is adjacent to the Natomas Basin Conservancy’s Cummings preserve to the south, Fisherman’s Lake to the east, rice land to the north, and the Sacramento River to the west. Because it is surrounded by compatible land uses and habitat expected to persist in the future, this site has long-term conservation value. The Natomas 130 Site provides potential habitat connectivity for giant garter snake to existing preserves and Lone Tree Canal via a series of water drainage and delivery channels. A minimum of 14.2 acres of managed marsh, including 4.3 acres of upland habitat, shall be created and preserved for giant garter snake on the North Natomas 130 Site. The 4.3 acres of upland habitat shall also serve as mitigation for impacts to Swainson’s hawk described under Impact 6.12-2. To further reduce impacts to Swainson’s hawk, 14.2 acres of high-quality foraging habitat shall be managed to provide Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat on the North Natomas 130 Site. Habitat created and preserved on the North Natomas 130 Site shall also include 1.9 acres of riparian, which could provide potential nesting sites for</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Swainson’s hawk.</p> <p>b. The off-site conservation lands shall be restored with giant garter snake habitat consisting of a mosaic of habitat types with variations in topography and an abundance of edges within and between habitat types. The managed marsh shall consist of seasonal marsh with shallow and deep water configurations, permanent marsh, and upland habitats in the form of buffers, islands, and other high-ground habitats scattered throughout the marsh’s wetland component. A significant portion of the upland component shall be above winter flood levels to protect giant garter snakes in their winter retreats. Vegetation shall be natural marsh vegetation such as cattails, spike rush, tule clumps, and thimbleberry, placed to maximize protected resting and basking sites and escape cover for the snakes.</p> <p><b>3. On-site Avoidance and Minimization Measures</b></p> <p>The measures described below shall be incorporated into the giant garter snake conservation strategy to avoid and minimize take of giant garter snakes during construction activities, including construction of managed marsh habitat:</p> <p>a. All grading activity within giant garter snake habitat (aquatic habitat and uplands within 200 feet of aquatic habitat) shall be restricted to a period between May 1 and October 1. Because this is during the snakes’ active stage, it would allow snakes to actively move away from danger and thereby reduce chances of snake mortality. Additionally, this restriction is timed to avoid grading during the snakes’ breeding, dispersal, fall foraging and over-wintering periods, when they are most vulnerable to disturbance. If grading cannot be scheduled between May 1 and October 1, the Applicant shall contact the USFWS to determine whether additional measures are necessary to avoid and/or minimize take of giant garter snake. Grading</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>shall only occur during the period between October 2 and April 30 upon written USFWS approval.</p> <p>b. A qualified biologist with experience identifying giant garter snakes shall survey the construction area for giant garter snakes no more than 24 hours prior to the start of construction activities. If construction activities stop on the project site for a period of two weeks or more, a new giant garter snake survey shall be completed no more than 24 hours prior to the re-start of construction activities.</p> <p>c. Between April 15 and September 30, all irrigation ditches, canals, or other aquatic habitat within the construction area shall be completely dewatered, with no ponded water remaining, for at least 15 consecutive days prior to the excavation or filling in of the dewatered habitat. The purpose of dewatering the aquatic habitat prior to filling is to compel giant garter snakes to leave the area on their own. A qualified biological monitor shall ensure that dewatered habitat does not continue to support giant garter snake prey, which could attract snakes into the area. Netting and salvage of prey may be necessary if a site cannot be completely dewatered.</p> <p>d. Construction activity shall be avoided within the approximately 250-foot Lone Tree Canal linear open space/buffer area, except for the purpose of habitat restoration activities carried out under the direction of a qualified biological monitor with experience identifying giant garter snakes. To minimize habitat disturbance during construction of the urban development, the approximate 250-foot wide corridor shall be bordered on the outer edge with exclusionary fencing that shall prevent giant garter snakes from entering the construction area, but shall allow any giant garter snakes within the construction area, that may have otherwise been trapped, to cross into</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the canal corridor. Movement of heavy equipment associated with construction of the urban development shall be restricted to the construction area outside the corridor, except for approved restoration activity within the corridor.</p> <p>e. Clearing and grading shall be confined to the minimum area necessary to facilitate construction activities as determined by a qualified biologist. Habitat that will be avoided shall be cordoned off, clearly flagged, and designated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area” by a qualified biologist. An exclusion fence shall be erected between the development area and the Lone Tree Canal linear open space/buffer area prior to and during construction to prevent giant garter snake entry into the construction zone. The fence shall be erected prior to the onset of the dormant season preceding construction when giant garter snakes are less likely to occupy upland retreats on the project site. The interior or project side of the exclusion fence shall be routinely monitored for giant garter snakes stranded by the fence. Snakes encountered should be relocated to the nearest suitable habitat off-site by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>f. All construction personnel shall receive worker environmental awareness training from a USFWS-approved biologist prior to commencing any construction-related activities on the project site. This training shall instruct workers on how to identify the giant garter snake and its habitat, and what to do if a giant garter snake is encountered during construction activities.</p> <p>g. A USFWS-approved biological monitor shall be present during grading activities within 200 feet of aquatic giant garter snake habitat to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into unauthorized areas. If a live giant</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>garter snake is found during construction activities, the biological monitor shall immediately notify USFWS. The biological monitor shall have the authority to stop construction in the vicinity of the snake. The snake shall be monitored and given a chance to leave the area on its own. If the snake does not show signs of leaving, then the biological monitor shall slowly move toward the snake to flush it toward adjacent habitat away from the construction area. Potential escape routes for giant garter snakes shall be determined in advance of construction. If the garter snake does not leave on its own within 1 working day, the biological monitor shall consult with the USFWS to determine necessary additional measures. Any giant garter snake mortality shall also be reported by the biological monitor within 1 working day to USFWS. Any project-related activity that results in giant garter snake mortality shall cease so that this activity can be modified to the extent practicable to avoid future mortality.</p> <p>h. Upon completion of construction activities, construction debris shall be completely removed from the site. If this material is situated near existing giant garter snake aquatic habitat, it shall be inspected by a qualified biologist prior to removal to assure that giant garter snakes are not using it for hibernaculae or temporary refuge.</p> <p>i. No plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar erosion control matting that could entangle snakes shall be placed on a project site when working within 200 feet of snake aquatic or rice habitat. Possible substitutions include coconut coir matting, tactified hydroseeding compounds, or other material approved by DFG and USFWS.</p>	
<p><b>6.12-2: Effects to Swainson’s Hawk.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would directly and permanently affect 512 acres of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat and could</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<p><b>6.12-2: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. The project shall include a conservation strategy</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>affect nesting in the vicinity of the project site. This impact would be considered significant.</p>		<p>which shall be designed to include avoidance, minimization and compensation measures that are adequate to assure that the proposed project shall not compromise the effectiveness of the NBHCP. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require preservation of 27.9 acres of on-site managed grassland within the Lone Tree Canal linear open space/buffer area, which would provide low-quality Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, and would require off-site habitat at several locations Off-site mitigation for impacts to Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat on the Spangler Site would include creation and management of 55.2 acres of upland habitat that would provide moderate-quality foraging habitat, and creation and management of 45.4 acres of high-quality foraging habitat. Off-site mitigation on the North Natomas 130 Site would include creation and preservation of 4.3 acres of moderate-quality foraging habitat and 14.2 acres of high-quality foraging habitat. Off-site mitigation at the North Natomas 130 site also includes creation and preservation of 1.9 acres of riparian habitat that could provide potential nesting sites for Swainson’s hawks.</p> <p>In addition to creation and management of foraging habitat provided by Mitigation Measure 6.12-1, the project applicant shall acquire a minimum of 49 acres of land enhanced and managed to provide high-quality foraging habitat so that the cumulative value of on-site and off-site habitat is of equal or greater value to Swainson’s hawk than that lost through project development. Swainson’s hawk habitat acquired off-site shall either be located within 1 mile of the Swainson’s hawk zone or an existing TNBC reserve, or, with USFWS and DFG concurrence, within two miles of more than one active Swainson’s hawk nests.</p> <p>Thus, in total, 27.9 acres of low-quality, 59.5 acres of moderate-quality, 108.6 acres (including the additional 49 acres referenced above) of high-quality, and 1.9 acres of</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>potential nesting habitat would be provided as mitigation for the loss of approximately 546 acres of low- and moderate-quality foraging habitat.</p> <p>The totals described above represent the acreage, of the quality described, likely to mitigate the loss of habitat value associated with the proposed project. This represents potential acreage within a range that could be used to mitigate loss of habitat value. Acquired and preserved acreage could range up to a replacement of 1:1 (or higher) ratio, if needed to replace lost habitat value. Alternatively, a lesser acreage that is enhanced and managed as high-quality foraging habitat (e.g., alfalfa) for Swainson’s hawk in perpetuity, as proposed herein, would be acceptable provided that USFWS and DFG concur that, with the replacement habitat, the project would provide equal or greater value to the species than would the foraging habitat present at the project site. Compliance and biological effectiveness monitoring shall be performed and annual monitoring reports shall be prepared. This monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management shall be performed as described in Section IV of the NBHCP.</p> <p>b. In addition, the following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for Swainson’s hawk and other raptors no more than 14 days and no less than 7 days prior to the beginning of any construction activity between March 15 and August 15. The survey area shall include all potential nesting sites located within ½ mile of the project and mitigation-sites</li> <li>2. Should nesting be discovered within the survey area, a qualified biologist shall notify DFG and no new disturbance shall occur within ½ mile of the nest until the nest is no longer active or appropriate avoidance measures are approved by DFG to ensure that the nest is adequately</li> </ol>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		protected. Potential mitigation measures may include visual screening and timing restrictions for construction activity. Monitoring (funded by the project applicant) of active nests by a DFG-approved raptor biologist shall be required to determine if project construction is disturbing Swainson’s hawks at the nest site. Exact implementation of this measure shall be based on specific information at the project site.	
<p><b>6.12-3: Loss and Degradation of Wetlands and Waters of the United States.</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands subject to USACE jurisdiction under the federal Clean Water Act, and the potential loss and degradation of isolated wetland habitats protected under state regulations. Placement of fill in these waters would require a Section 404 permit from USACE and compliance with Porter-Cologne and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, and Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p><b>6.12-3: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-1 to avoid impacts to waters of the United States and wetlands associated with Lone Tree Canal.</li> <li>b. Prior to project approval, the project applicant shall obtain a verified wetland delineation from USACE. Based on the results of the verified delineation, the project applicant shall commit to replace, restore, or enhance on a “no net loss” basis, in accordance with USACE and the Central Valley RWQCB, as appropriate for each agency’s jurisdiction, the acreage of all waters of the United States and wetland habitats, including isolated wetlands that would be removed with implementation of the project. Wetland restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods acceptable to the USACE, DFG, and Central Valley RWQCB, as determined during the Section 404, Section 1600, and Section 401 permitting processes.</li> <li>c. In conjunction with preparation and implementation of the giant garter snake mitigation described under Mitigation Measure 6.12-1, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a habitat mitigation and monitoring plan to USACE for the creation of jurisdictional waters at a mitigation ratio no less than 1:1 acres of created water of the United States, including wetlands, to each acre filled. The mitigation plans shall demonstrate how the USACE criteria for jurisdictional</li> </ul>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>waters will be met through implementation. Wetland mitigation achieved through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.12-1 can satisfy this mitigation measure if conducted in such a way that it meets both habitat function and the USACE criteria for creation of waters of the United States. The wetland creation section of the habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ target areas for creation,</li> <li>▶ a complete biological assessment of the existing resources on the target areas,</li> <li>▶ specific creation and restoration plans for each target area,</li> <li>▶ performance standards for success that will illustrate that the compensation ratios are met, and</li> <li>▶ a monitoring plan including schedule and annual report format.</li> </ul> <p>d. The project applicant shall secure the following permits and regulatory approvals, as necessary, and implement all permit conditions before implementation of any construction activities associated with the proposed project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authorization for the fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States shall be secured prior to placing any fill in jurisdictional wetlands from the USACE through the CWA Section 404 permitting process. Timing for compliance with the specific conditions of the 404 permit shall be per conditions specified by the USACE as part of permit issuance. It is expected that the project would require an individual permit because wetland impacts would total more than 0.5 acre. In its final stage and once approved by the USACE, this mitigation plan is expected to detail proposed wetland restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement activities that would ensure no net loss of jurisdictional wetlands function and values in the project</li> </ol>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>vicinity. As required by Section 404, approval and implementation of the wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall ensure no net loss of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands. Mitigation for impacts to isolated wetlands shall be included in the same mitigation plan. All mitigation requirements identified through this process shall be implemented before construction begins in any areas containing wetland features.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Prior to construction in any areas containing wetland features, the project applicant shall obtain water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for the project. Any measures required as part of the issuance of water quality certification shall be implemented.</li> <li>3. The project applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish &amp; Game Code for impacts to Waters of the State as defined under Section 1602 of the California Fish &amp; Game Code.</li> <li>4. The project applicant shall file a report of waste discharge with the Central Valley RWQCB for activities affecting waters of the state. For other mitigation measures aimed at maintaining water quality, including obtaining National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, see Mitigation Measure 6.10-1 in "Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality."</li> </ol>	
<p><b>6.12-4: Disturbance or Removal of Special-status Plant Species.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in the disturbance or loss of Delta tule pea and Sanford's arrowhead. Delta tule-pea and Sanford's arrowhead could be present in the freshwater marsh habitat within the wetland habitats on the project site. The potential loss of a special-</p>	PS	<p><b>6.12-4: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Before the initiation of any ground-disturbing or vegetation-clearing activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified botanist to conduct focused surveys in the project area for Delta tule pea and Sanford's arrowhead. The botanist shall conduct surveys for these special-status plant species at</li> </ol>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>status plant population would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>the appropriate time of year when the target species would be in flower, and therefore, clearly identifiable Surveys shall be conducted following the approved DFG protocol for surveying for special-status plant species.</p> <p>b. If no special-status plants are found during focused surveys, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter report to USFWS, DFG, and CNPS and no further mitigation shall be required.</p> <p>c. If special-status plant populations are found, the project applicant shall consult with the DFG to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for any population that may be affected by the project. Mitigation measures may include creation of off-site populations on project mitigation sites, through seed collection or transplanting, preserving and enhancing existing populations, or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to compensate for the impact.</p>	
<p><b>6.12-5: Modifications to Burrowing Owl Habitat.</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in the loss of burrowing owl habitat or active burrows. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p align="center">PS</p>	<p><b>6.12-5: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> <p>a. No more than 30 days and no less than 14 day prior to project site grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct focused surveys for burrowing owls in areas of suitable habitat on and within 300 feet of the project site. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with DFG protocol (DFG 1995).</p> <p>b. If no occupied burrows are found in the survey area, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings shall be submitted to DFG, and no further mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>c. If occupied burrows are found in the survey area, impacts shall be avoided by establishing a buffer of 165 feet during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) or 300 feet during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). The size of the buffer area may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and DFG determine it would not be likely to have adverse effects. No project activity shall commence</p>	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the burrow is no longer occupied. If the burrow is occupied by a nesting pair, a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat contiguous to the burrow shall be preserved until the breeding season is over.</p> <p>d. If impacts to occupied burrows are unavoidable, on-site passive relocation techniques may be used if approved by DFG to encourage owls to move to alternative burrows outside of the impact area. However, no occupied burrows shall be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that the burrow is no longer occupied. Foraging habitat for relocated pairs shall be provided in accordance with guidelines provided by DFG (1995). DFG guidelines recommend a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat per pair or unpaired resident bird, be acquired and permanently protected.</p> <p>e. If relocation of the owls is approved for the site by DFG, the developer shall hire a qualified biologist to prepare a plan for relocating the owls to a suitable site. The relocation plan must include: (a) the location of the nest and owls proposed for relocation; (b) the location of the proposed relocation-site; (c) the number of owls involved and the time of year when the relocation is proposed to take place; (d) the name and credentials of the biologist who will be retained to supervise the relocation; (e) the proposed method of capture and transport for the owls to the new site; (f) a description of the site preparations at the relocation-site (e.g., enhancement of existing burrows, creation of artificial burrows, one-time or long-term vegetation control, etc.); and (g) a description of efforts and funding support proposed to monitor the relocation. Relocation options may include passive relocation to another area of the site not subject to disturbance through one way doors on burrow openings, or construction of</p>	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		artificial burrows in accordance DFG guidelines. f. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-2 to mitigate for the loss of burrowing owl foraging habitat.	
<p><b>6.12-6: Effects to Northwestern Pond Turtle.</b> Uplands and aquatic habitat on the project site suitable for giant garter snake is also considered potential habitat for northwestern pond turtle. Therefore, 55.56 acres of potential upland and aquatic habitat for western pond turtle would be permanently lost, 3.31 acres of upland and aquatic northwestern pond turtle habitat would be temporarily affected. The value of all northwestern pond turtle habitat on the project site is considered low because of insufficient water and the lack of emergent marsh vegetation in the excavated channels on the project site. However, Lone Tree canal and other areas that have the potential to support surface water of sufficient depths provide suitable habitat for this species. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.12-6: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b></p> a. The project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. b. Construction personnel shall participate in a worker environmental awareness program. Under this program, workers shall be informed about the potential presence of western pond turtles in the construction area, and shall be provided guidance on appropriate steps to take if a pond turtle is encountered during project construction. c. Within 24 hours prior to commencement of construction activities, the site shall be inspected for turtles by a qualified biologist. The construction area shall be re-inspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater has occurred. d. If a turtle is encountered on the project site, any construction activity that could result in harm of the turtle shall immediately cease and shall not resume until the monitoring biologist has determined that the turtle has moved away from the construction-site on their own volition or a qualified biologist has moved the turtle to a safe location.	LTS
<p><b>6.12-7: Local Tree Protection Ordinance.</b> The project would not result in the loss of any protected trees; therefore, no impact would occur.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required	NI

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.12-8: Potential Loss of Loggerhead Shrike Nests.</b> Shrubs and weedy vegetation on the project site provide potential nesting habitat for the loggerhead shrike. This species has been observed on the project site. The loss of an active loggerhead shrike nest would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.12-8: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> If initiation of site grading is proposed during the loggerhead shrike nesting season (March 1 to July 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a focused surveys for loggerhead shrikes in areas of suitable habitat on and within 300 feet of the project site. The survey shall be conducted no more than 30 days and no less than 14 days prior to the start of grading. If surveys identify an active loggerhead shrike nest in the survey area, the applicant shall install brightly colored construction fencing that establishes a boundary 100 feet from the active nest. No disturbance associated with the proposed project shall occur within the 100-foot fenced area during the nesting season of March 1 through July 31 or until a qualified biologist has determine that the young have fledged or that the nest is no longer occupied prior to disturbance of the nest site.</p>	LTS
<p><b>6.12-9: Potential to Conflict with the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.</b> The project with the proposed mitigation for impacts to giant garter snake and Swainson’s hawk (Mitigation Measures 6.12-1 and 6.12-2) would not reduce the viability of populations of covered species using the Natomas Basin and would not reduce the effectiveness of the conservation strategy of the NBHCP. It also would have only minimal effects on the likelihood of attaining any of the goals and objectives of the NBHCP, and for most of these goals and objectives the overall effect would be neutral or beneficial. Therefore, with proposed mitigation, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6.13 Cultural Resources			
<p><b>6.13-1: Damage or Destruction of Significant Documented Cultural Resources.</b> No significant cultural resources have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impacts to CRHR-listed or eligible resources.</p>	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure



**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.13-2: Potential Impacts to Undocumented Cultural Resources.</b> There is the possibility that previously undiscovered and undocumented resources could be adversely affected or otherwise altered by ground disturbing activities during construction of the project. Disturbance of undocumented resources would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.13-2: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA and develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources could include, but not necessarily be limited to in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations and would be conducted in a manner consistent with CEQA and the City’s guidelines for preserving archaeological and cultural artifacts.</p>	LTS
<p><b>6.13-3: Potential to Uncover Human Remains.</b> Subsurface disturbances associated with construction activities at the project site could potentially uncover unmarked historic-era and prehistoric Native American burials, resulting in their alteration or damage. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p><b>6.13-3: (City of Sacramento and LAFCo)</b> In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities all such activities in the vicinity of the find shall be halted immediately and the City or the City’s designated representative shall be notified. The City shall immediately notify the county coroner and a qualified professional archaeologist. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]). The responsibilities of the Agency for acting</p>	LTS

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in detail in the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9. The City or their appointed representative and the professional archaeologist shall consult with a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) determined by the NAHC regarding the removal or preservation and avoidance of the remains and determine if additional burials could be present in the vicinity.	

NI = No Impact    LTS = Less than Significant    PS = Potentially Significant    S = Significant    SU = Significant and Unavoidable    MM = Mitigation Measure