

RESOLUTION 2023-0231

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

June 27, 2023

Determining Project is Exempt from Review Under the California Environmental Quality Act for the Grace Rezone and Mixed-Use Project (002-0165-025 and -015) (P21-032)

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

BACKGROUND

- A. On May 17, 2023, the Preservation Commission conducted a public hearing, for which notice was given pursuant to Sacramento City Code chapter 17.812, received and considered evidence concerning the Project, and forwarded to the Planning and Design Commission and City Council a recommendation to approve the Project.
- B. On May 25, 2023, the Planning and Design Commission conducted a public hearing, for which notice was given pursuant to Sacramento City Code chapter 17.812, received and considered evidence concerning the Project, and forwarded to City Council a recommendation to approve the Project.
- C. On June 27, 2023, the City Council conducted a public hearing, for which notice was given pursuant to Sacramento City Code chapter 17.812, and received and considered evidence concerning the Project.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.

Based on the determination and recommendation of the City's Environmental Planning Services Manager and the oral and documentary evidence received at the hearing on the project, the City Council finds that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21155.4 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182(b) as follows:

- 1. On April 19, 2018, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq. (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §15000 et seq.), and the City of Sacramento environmental guidelines, the City Council approved an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and

adopted Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations and approved the Central City Specific Plan (CCSP).

2. The project is a mixed-use development project within the meaning of PRC section 21155.4(a).
3. The project is located in a transit priority area within the meaning of PRC section 21155.4(a)(1).
4. The project is consistent with the CCSP as required by PRC section 21155.4(a)(2).
5. The project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area as set forth in the Sacramento Area Organization of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transit Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, which has been accepted by the California Air Resources Board as applicable achieving greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
6. There have been no substantial changes proposed in the specific plan that would require major changes in the CCSP EIR, or changes in the circumstances under which the EIR was prepared or new information that has become available.

SECTION 2.

The project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and will not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b)(3).).

SECTION 3.

Upon approval of the Project, the Planning Director shall file or cause to be filed a Notice of Exemption with the Sacramento County Clerk and, if the project requires a discretionary approval from any state agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to section 21152(a) of the Public Resources Code and the State EIR Guidelines adopted pursuant thereto.

SECTION 4.

Pursuant to Guidelines section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which Staff has based its decision, including the previously-certified EIR, are located in and may be obtained from, the Community Development Department at 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, California 95811.

SECTION 5.

Exhibits A and B are part of this resolution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Exhibit A – SACOG MTP/SCS Consistency Letter

Exhibit B – Resolution 2018-00129 Certifying the CCSP EIR & MMP

Adopted by the City of Sacramento City Council on June 27, 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes: Members Guerra, Jennings, Kaplan, Loloee, and Mayor Steinberg

Noes: None

Abstain: Members Maple, Talamantes, Valenzuela, and Vang

Absent: None

Attest:



07/05/2023

Mindy Cuppy, City Clerk

The presence of an electronic signature certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy as approved by the Sacramento City Council.



1415 L Street,
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA
95814

916.321.9000
sacog.org

September 19, 2022

Ron Bess, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: MTP/SCS Consistency for the Grace Project

Dear Mr. Bess:

You requested SACOG's confirmation that the proposed Grace Project is consistent with the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) and is located within a Transit Priority Area (TPA), pursuant to PRC § 21155.4. SACOG provides a consistency determination at the request of the lead agency. However, it is the responsibility of the lead agency to make the final determination on a project's consistency with the MTP/SCS. This letter concurs with the City's determination that the Grower's District Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS and is located within a TPA. SACOG reviewed the project description and SCS consistency analysis compared to the MTP/SCS assumptions for the project area in order to make our determination.

The Grace Project is located at 620 15th Street in the City of Sacramento. The Project proposes a 3-story 25,929 square foot mixed use building with 32 residential units on 2 parcels totaling 0.22 acres. The project is located within a Transit Priority Area, pursuant to PRC § 21155.4. Transit Priority Areas are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop existing or planned (if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Regional Transportation Plan adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations). The Project site is within ½ mile from multiple light rail stations on Sacramento Regional Transit's Blue Line, which qualify as major transit stops. The Project's proximity to these stations demonstrate that the project site is within a TPA.

The Grace Project is an infill project within the Center/Corridor Community designation of the MTP/SCS for the City of Sacramento. Within the Center/Corridor Community, the MTP/SCS forecasts a range of low to high density residential, commercial, office, and industrial uses (MTP/SCS Appendix D). The project's land uses fall within this range of general uses, densities, and building intensities. The MTP/SCS also relies heavily on consistency with the City's General Plan. Infill projects that are consistent with the General Plan are generally considered consistent with the MTP/SCS. Therefore, development at the proposed densities is consistent with the build out assumptions for the area within this community type of the MTP/SCS.

With respect to consistency with the MTP/SCS policies, the applicable policies are embedded in the metrics and growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS. For the

Auburn
Citrus Heights
Colfax
Davis
El Dorado County
Elk Grove
Folsom
Galt
Isleton
Lincoln
Live Oak
Loomis
Marysville
Placer County
Placerville
Rancho Cordova
Rocklin
Roseville
Sacramento
Sacramento County
Sutter County
West Sacramento
Wheatland
Winters
Woodland
Yolo County
Yuba City
Yuba County

purposes of determining SCS consistency, projects consistent with the growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS are consistent with these policies. The MTP/SCS housing forecast for the Center/Corridor Communities was based not only on the City's land use plans and policies, but also on the following: an assessment of past building activity, current project entitlement activity, and consideration of changing demographic and housing market demand. Infill development and redevelopment is a strategy essential to the success of the Blueprint Preferred Scenario and the MTP/SCS. The Blueprint Preferred Scenario and the 2020 MTP/SCS achieve transportation, air quality, and other quality of life benefits by relying in part on infill and redevelopment projects such as this one. The proposed project is consistent with MTP/SCS growth forecast assumptions.

Thank you for inviting SACOG's input as to the consistency of the Grace Project with the MTP/SCS. Our confirmation of the project's consistency with the MTP/SCS is not intended to express any opinion on the site design or the appropriate conditions of approval of the project. If you have further questions or need further assistance, please don't hesitate to contact me at (916) 340-6246.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Clint Holtzen', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Clint Holtzen
Planning Manager

DETERMINATION OF MTP/SCS CONSISTENCY WORKSHEET

As of October 27, 2020ⁱ

Background: Pursuant to SB 375 and SB 743, streamlined CEQA review and analysis is available to certain land use projects that are consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS was adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board as part of the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) on November 18, 2019. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) provided an Acceptance of GHG Quantification Determination for the SACOG SCS in October 2020.

Purpose: The purpose of this worksheet is to provide lead agencies with guidance to determine whether a project is consistent with the general land use designation, density, intensity, and applicable policies of the 2020 MTP/SCS adopted by SACOG.

The lead agency has responsibility to make the final determination on these matters and to determine the applicable and appropriate CEQA streamlining, if any.

Directions: This worksheet should be completed by the lead agency, relying on the project description of the proposed project and [Appendix C and D of the MTP/SCS](#). Regardless of whether this optional worksheet is used to assist in determining consistency with the MTP/SCS, a project can only be consistent with the MTP/SCS if it is consistent with the general land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in the adopted MTP/SCS. This worksheet only applies to the 2020 MTP/SCS (adopted November 18, 2019); subsequent MTP/SCS adoptions may require updates to this form.

Lead agencies are welcome to contact SACOG for assistance in completing this worksheet. For assistance, contact Dov Kadin at dkadin@sacog.org.

Project Title	The Grace Project (P21-032)	
Proposed Project is Located In (city/county name)		
Applicable Community Type Proposed Project is Located in The MTP/SCS land use forecast is illustrated using Community Types. In order to determine the general use designation, density and intensity of the Project area within the MTP/SCS, the Project must be located within a Community Type designated in the MTP/SCS. Use the map on page 4 of Appendix C of the MTP/SCS to identify the Community Type for the Project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Center and Corridor Community
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Established Community
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Developing Community (list the specific name of the Developing Community as identified in Appendix C of the MTP/SCS beginning on page 5):
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural Residential Community

DETERMINATION OF MTP/SCS CONSISTENCY WORKSHEET

As of October 16, 2020

Required Consistency with the SCS: General Use Designation, Density and Intensity, and Applicable MTP/SCS Policies (PRC § 21155(a) and PRC § 21159.28(a))

General Use Designation, Density and Building Intensity. The foundation of the land use designations for the MTP/SCS is adopted and proposed local general plans, community plans, specific plans and other local policies and regulations. A project is consistent with the MTP/SCS if its uses are identified in the applicable MTP/SCS Community Type *and* its uses meet the general density and building intensity assumptions for the Community Type. The proposed project does not have to include all allowed uses in the MTP/SCS.

Applicable MTP/SCS Policies. For the purposes of determining SCS consistency, the policies of the MTP/SCS are embedded in the metrics and growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS. Projects consistent with the growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS, as determined by the criteria below, are consistent with the MTP/SCS and its policies.

Determine consistency of the Project using **one** of the four methods below:

Consistency Option	Criteria
Option A <input type="checkbox"/>	The Project is located in a Center and Corridor Community or an Established Community and the Project uses are consistent with the allowed uses of the applicable adopted local land use plan as it existed in 2019 and are at least 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the allowed uses of the applicable local land use plans. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS. ⁱⁱ
Option B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Project is located in a Center and Corridor Community or an Established Community and the Project uses have been reviewed in the context of, and are found to be consistent with, the general land use, density, and intensity information provided for this Community Type in Appendix D of the MTP/SCS (beginning on page 30). Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.
Option C <input type="checkbox"/>	The Project is located in a Rural Residential Community and the Project residential density does not exceed the maximum density of one unit per acre as specified in the MTP/SCS, and employment development in the Project is at least 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the applicable local land use plans. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.
Option D <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Project is located in a Developing Community and the Project's average net density meets or exceed the average net density described for this specific Developing Community (as referenced by name of applicable specific plan, master plan, or special plan in Appendix D of the MTP/SCS) and employment development in the Project is consistent with the general employment land uses described for this specific Developing Community.ⁱⁱⁱ In addition, development from the project when added to other entitled projects will not exceed the MTP/SCS build out assumptions for the area within this Community Type, which are:</p> <p>New Housing Units: <input type="text"/></p> <p>New Employees: <input type="text"/></p>

DETERMINATION OF MTP/SCS CONSISTENCY WORKSHEET

As of October 16, 2020

Conclusion	
The proposed project is consistent with the General Use Designation, Density and Intensity, and Applicable MTP/SCS Policies for the following reasons <i>(summarize findings on use designation, density and intensity for the Project evaluation completed above):</i>	

ⁱ This document may be updated as users provide feedback on its utility.

ⁱⁱ The MTP/SCS general land use, density and intensity in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities is based on 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the land use designations in applicable local land use plans as they existed in 2016, unless otherwise noted in [Appendix C and D](#).

ⁱⁱⁱ The MTP/SCS land use forecast in Developing Communities was modeled according to adopted and proposed specific plans, master plans, and special plans as they existed in 2016, and is based on the housing and employment totals and the average net density of these plans, as outlined in [Appendix C and D](#).

RESOLUTION NO. 2018-00129

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

April 19, 2018

Certifying the Environmental Impact Report and Adopting the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Findings of Fact, and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Central City Specific Plan (LR16-006)

BACKGROUND

- A. On March 8, 2018, the City Planning and Design Commission conducted a public hearing on the Central City Specific Plan at which it reviewed and considered the Environmental Impact Report for the projects and passed a motion to forward to the City Council a recommendation to approve the project.
- B. On April 19, 2018, the City Council conducted a public hearing that was noticed in accordance with Sacramento City Code sections 17.812.010 and 17.812.030 at which it received and considered oral testimony and other evidence concerning the Central City Specific Plan.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

- Section 1. The City Council finds that the Environmental Impact Report for the Central City Specific Plan (herein EIR), which consists of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR (Response to Comments) (collectively the "EIR") has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures.
- Section 2. The City Council certifies that the EIR was prepared, published, circulated and reviewed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures, and constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective and complete Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the Sacramento Local Environmental Procedures.
- Section 3. The City Council certifies that the EIR has been presented to it, that the City Council has reviewed the EIR and has considered the information contained in the EIR prior to acting on the proposed project, and that the EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis.

- Section 4. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, and in support of its approval of the projects, the City Council adopts the attached Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations in support of approval of the project as set forth in the attached Exhibit A of this Resolution.
- Section 5. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, and in support of its approval of the projects, the City Council adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Plan to require all reasonably feasible mitigation measures be implemented by means of the projects' conditions, agreements, or other measures, as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) as set forth in Exhibit B of this Resolution. In case of conflict between the MMP and the mitigation measures described in Exhibit A, the MMP shall control.
- Section 6. The City Council directs that, upon adoption of approvals for the projects, the City Manager shall file a notice of determination with the County Clerk of Sacramento County and with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Section 21152.
- Section 7. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from the Office of the City Clerk at 915 I Street, Sacramento, California. The City Clerk is the custodian of records for all matters before the City Council.

Table of Contents:

Exhibit A - CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Central City Specific Plan

Exhibit B - Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Central City Specific Plan

Adopted by the City of Sacramento City Council on April 19, 2018, by the following vote:

Ayes: Members Ashby, Carr, Guerra, Hansen, Harris, Jennings, Schenirer and Mayor Steinberg

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Member Warren

Attest:

Exhibit A

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sacramento Central City Specific Plan

Description of the Project

The Sacramento Central City Specific Plan (CCSP) is designed to facilitate future development within the City of Sacramento's central core to create a vibrant downtown where people can live, work, and play. The CCSP seeks to implement the vision articulated in the Sacramento 2035 General Plan, including the Central City Community Plan (CCCP), customizing the planning process and land use regulations to the unique characteristics of the Central City. Subsequent development projects, zoning regulations, public improvements, and related activities within the CCSP area would be required to be consistent with the CCSP.

The overall goal of the Central City Specific Plan (CCSP) is the orderly and systematic development and integration of housing within the CCSP area that is compatible with site characteristics and consistent with the City's goals and policies.

The proposed CCSP includes the following aspects:

- The CCSP seeks to encourage future growth in the city within existing urbanized areas, and the central business district, to foster infill development, as well as encourage density of development and integration of housing with commercial, office, and entertainment uses to foster increased pedestrian and bicycling, and use of public transportation, to reduce automobile use.
- Accommodation of growth within the CCSP area that protects important environmental resources as well as ensures long-term economic sustainability and health, and equity or social wellbeing for the entire community.
- Develop varied and unique housing options that appeal to a wide range of residents and reflect the diversity of Sacramento.
- Facilitate creation of new places to live in Downtown consistent with the City's Downtown Housing Initiative and general plan.

The proposed CCSP was developed in accordance with the Downtown Housing Initiative, which is intended to facilitate development of at least 10,000 new places to live in Downtown Sacramento over the next ten years. For the purposes of the Downtown Housing Initiative, Downtown includes the Railyards and River District Specific Plan areas. Although the proposed CCSP allows for increased opportunities for development, it is anticipated that the actual amount of development that would occur over the next 20 years would be generally

consistent with what has been assumed to occur over that timeframe under the Sacramento 2035 General Plan. It is anticipated up to 13,401 new housing units, approximately 3.8 million square feet (sf) of new non-residential uses, and 750 hotel rooms would be built in the CCSP area. There would also be an additional 3.3 million sf of backfill non-residential development, which includes new uses that would occur within existing buildings and, in turn, allow for a total development potential of 7.1 million sf of non-residential uses when combined with the new growth. It is assumed that most of the new housing units projected in the CCSP area would be multifamily units.

Findings Required Under CEQA

1. Procedural Findings

The City Council of the City of Sacramento finds as follows:

The Draft EIR for the City of Sacramento's Central City Specific Plan (CCSP) (SCH # 2017022048) was prepared, noticed, published, circulated, reviewed, and completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.* ("CEQA")), the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.*), and the City of Sacramento environmental guidelines, as follows:

- a. A Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR was filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and each responsible and trustee agency and was circulated for public comments from February 15, 2017 through March 17, 2017.
- b. A public scoping meeting was held on March 2, 2017, at Sacramento City Hall, 915 I Street, Sacramento, California, 95814, to request the public's input on the scope and content of the environmental information that should be addressed in the Draft EIR.
- c. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the OPR on September 22, 2017, and to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the plan, or which exercise authority over resources that may be affected by the plan, and to other interested parties and agencies as required by law. The comments of such persons and agencies were sought.
- d. An official 45-day public review and comment period for the Draft EIR was established by the OPR. The official OPR public comment period began on September 22, 2017 and ended on November 8, 2017.
- e. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was mailed on September 22, 2017 to all interested groups, organizations, and individuals who had previously requested notice in writing. The NOA stated that the City of

Sacramento had completed the Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, 300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor, Sacramento, California, 95811, and on the City's website. The letter also indicated that the official 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR would end on November 8, 2017.

f. A public notice was placed in the City's official newspaper, the Daily Recorder, on September 22, 2017, which stated that the Draft EIR was available for public review and comment.

g. A public notice was posted in the office of the Sacramento County Clerk on September 22, 2017.

h. The NOA and Draft EIR were published on the City's website at <http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports>.

i. An informational open house was held on October 9, 2017, at Sacramento City Hall, 915 I Street, Sacramento, California, 95814, to inform the public of key analyses and conclusions reached in the Draft EIR.

j. Following closure of the public comment period, all comments received on the Draft EIR during the comment period, the City's written responses to the significant environmental points raised in those comments, and additional information added by the City were added to the Draft EIR to produce the Final EIR.

k. The Final EIR was made available for public review and published on the City's website at <http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports>.

l. Notices were mailed to all federal and state agencies that provided comments on the Draft EIR. The notice sent to each agency included that agency's comment letter and proposed response to the comment letter.

m. In certifying the Final EIR, the City Council finds that the Final EIR does not add significant new information to the Draft EIR that would require recirculation of the EIR under CEQA because the Final EIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the proposed plan or from a new or revised mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible project alternative or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the plan but that was rejected by the City, or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. Instead, the modifications are either environmentally benign or

environmentally neutral, and thus represent the kinds of changes that commonly occur as the environmental review process works towards its conclusion. The City Council hereby determines, based on the standards provided in section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

2. Record of Proceedings

The contents of the record of proceedings shall be as set forth in subdivision (e) of Public Resources Code Section 21167.6. The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these findings:

- a. The Draft and Final EIR and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference therein;
- b. The City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan adopted March 3, 2015, and all updates;
- c. The Master Environmental Impact Report for the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan certified on March 3, 2015, and all updates;
- d. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Adoption of the Sacramento 2035 General Plan adopted March 3, 2015, and all updates;
- e. Planning and Development Code of the City of Sacramento, as amended as of the date of this Resolution;
- f. Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050, Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), December 2004;
- g. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), February 2016;
- h. The Central City Specific Plan, January 2018;
- i. Central City Special Planning District, January 2018; and
- j. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the CCSP.
- k. All records of decision, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, synopses of meetings, and other documents approved, reviewed, relied upon, or prepared by any City commissions, boards, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Project; and
- l. Any other materials required by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, or other applicable law, to be included in the record of proceedings.

3. Findings

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Mitigation measures or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, sub. (a), (b).)

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 includes another factor: “legal” considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (Goleta II)* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).) “[F]easibility” under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (Ibid.; see also *Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoiah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing “‘economic, environmental, social, and technological factors’ ... ‘an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground’”].)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are identified that are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project’s “benefits” rendered “acceptable” its “unavoidable adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15093, 15043, sub. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21081, sub. (b).)

In seeking to effectuate the substantive policy of CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible, an agency, in adopting findings, need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating approval of a proposed CCSP with significant impacts. Where a significant impact can be mitigated to an “acceptable” level solely by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternative that could also

substantially lessen or avoid that same impact — even if the alternative would render the impact less severe than would the proposed CCSP as mitigated. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (“*Laurel Heights I*”) (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

In these Findings, the City first addresses the extent to which each significant environmental effect can be substantially lessened or avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Only after determining that, even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, an effect is significant and unavoidable does the City address the extent to which alternatives described in the EIR are (i) environmentally superior with respect to that effect and (ii) “feasible” within the meaning of CEQA.

In the Statement of Overriding Considerations found at the end of these Findings, the City identifies the specific economic, social, and other considerations that, in its judgment, outweigh the significant environmental effects that the projects will cause.

The California Supreme Court has stated that “[t]he wisdom of approving ... any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (*Goleta II*) (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553, 564.)

In support of its approval of the plan, the City Council’s findings are set forth below for each of the potentially significant environmental effects and alternatives of the Projects identified in the EIR pursuant to Section 21080 of CEQA and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the impacts of the Projects and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the City Council ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the City Council adopts and incorporates all the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMP to substantially lessen

or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Projects. The City Council intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR to reduce or eliminate significant impacts resulting from the Project. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures, as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the Final EIR.

A. Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant and Thus Requiring No Mitigation.

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21002; CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.) Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the City Council finds that implementation of the projects will not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas, therefore, do not require mitigation.

Aesthetics, Light and Glare

4.1-1: The proposed CCSP could have a substantial adverse effect on an existing scenic resource or degrade the view of an important, existing scenic resource, as seen from a visually sensitive public location. (p. 4.1-35)

4.1-2: The proposed CCSP could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the CCSP area and its surroundings. (p. 4.1-40)

4.1-3: The proposed CCSP could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. (p. 4.1-42)

4.1-4: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts on scenic resources or degrade the views of an important, existing scenic resource, as seen from visually sensitive public locations. (p. 4.1-44)

4.1-5: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute substantial cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality in the vicinity. (p. 4.1-46)

4.1-6: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. (p. 4.1-46)

Air Quality

4.2-1: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. (p. 4.2-19)

4.2-4: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in a significant increase in CO concentrations. (p. 4.2-28)

4.2-5 (Construction): Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in short-term and long-term exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants. (p. 4.2-29)

However, impacts associated to short term exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants would be less-than-significant, these impacts would be further reduced with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(b), which states:

4.2-2(b)

Prior to the issuance of a demolition or building permit for major development projects in the CCSP area, each project shall be screened for construction emissions based on the then-current screening criteria established by the SMAQMD. If the project emissions fall within the limit of the screening criteria no further action is required.

If the project exceeds the screening criteria the applicant shall model emissions for the project. If the emissions fall below the thresholds of significance for construction air emissions no further action is required.

If the air emissions model reflects emissions above the thresholds for construction emissions, the applicant shall mitigate such emissions consistent with applicable rules and procedures of the SMAQMD and City of Sacramento. This includes the following:

The applicant shall include on all grading or improvement plans the following SMAQMD Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices:

- *Provide a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the proposed CCSP to the City and the SMAQMD. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The construction contractor shall provide the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. This information shall be submitted at least four business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the proposed CCSP, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs.*
- *Provide a plan in conjunction with the equipment inventory, approved by the SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.*
- *Emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site shall not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.*
- *If at the time of granting of each building permit, the SMAQMD has adopted a regulation applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation may completely or partially replace this mitigation. Consultation with the SMAQMD prior to construction will be necessary to make this determination.*

The applicant shall include the following SMAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans:

- *Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil.*
- *Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.*
- *Install wind breaks (e.g., plant trees, solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas.*
- *Plant vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.*
- *Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.*
- *Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust and road dust carryout onto public roads.*
- *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the District shall also be visible to ensure compliance.*

The applicant shall estimate and quantify the construction emissions of NO_x. The applicant shall pay into the SMAQMD's construction mitigation fund to offset construction-generated emissions of NO_x that exceed SMAQMD's daily emission threshold of 85 ppd. The applicants shall keep track of actual equipment use and their NO_x emissions so that mitigation fees can be adjusted accordingly for payment to the SMAQMD.

4.2-6: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could create objectionable odors. (p. 4.2-32)

4.2-9: The proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in CO concentrations. (p. 4.2-35)

Biological Resources

4.3-1: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. (p. 4.3-46)

4.3-3: Projects developed under the CCSP could result in impacts to special-status fish species and degradation of designated critical habitat. (p. 4.3-49)

4.3-5: Projects developed under the proposed CCSP could remove habitat for the western pond turtle. (p. 4.3-54)

4.3-7: Projects constructed under the proposed CCSP could result in impacts to special-status plant species. (p. 4.3-56)

4.3-9: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in interruption of contiguous habitat which would interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. (p. 4.3-59)

4.3-12: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative impacts to special-status fish species and degradation of designated critical habitat. (p. 4.3-62)

4.3-16: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of locally protected trees. (p. 4.3-65)

Cultural Resources

4.4-3: The proposed CCSP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5. (p. 4.4-34)

4.4-5: New construction in proposed CCSP area, in combination with other cumulative development within Sacramento County and the City downtown core, could contribute to the cumulative loss or alteration of historic built resources. (p. 4.4-36)

Energy Demand and Conservation

4.5-1: The proposed CCSP would increase demand for energy, specifically electricity and natural gas, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (p. 4.5-10)

4.5-2: The proposed CCSP could result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. (p. 4.5-11)

4.5-3: The proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for energy. (p. 4.5-14)

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

4.6-1: The proposed CCSP could introduce either geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on a site without protection against those hazards. (p. 4.6-20)

4.6-2: The proposed CCSP could expose people to risk associated with unstable soil conditions, including expansive soils and subsidence. (p. 4.6-21)

4.6-3: The proposed CCSP would allow development that could result in substantial soil erosion. (p. 4.6-22)

4.6-4: The proposed CCSP could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (p. 4.6-22)

4.6-5: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative increases in the number of people exposed to seismic and geologic risks. (p. 4.6-23)

4.6-6: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative increases in the number of people exposed to seismic and geologic risks. (p. 4.6-24)

Global Climate Change

4.7-1: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could conflict with the City of Sacramento's Climate Action Plan. (p. 4.7-18)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

4.8-2: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose people to asbestos-containing materials, lead-containing paint, PCBs, or other hazardous building materials or situations during demolition or renovation activities. (p. 4.8-19)

4.8-3: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose people to contaminated groundwater during construction or dewatering activities. (p. 4.8-20)

4.8-4: The proposed CCSP could increase the risk of exposure of site occupants to inadvertent or accidental releases of hazardous substances transported on adjacent roadways or rail lines near the site. (p. 4.8-23)

4.8-5: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (p. 4.8-24)

4.8-6: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (p. 4.8-25)

4.8-8: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts by exposing people to asbestos-containing materials, lead-containing paint, PCBs, or other hazardous materials or situations during demolition or renovation activities. (p. 4.8-26)

4.8-9: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could expose people to contaminated groundwater during construction or dewatering activities. (p. 4.8-27)

4.8-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could increase the risk of exposure of site

occupants to inadvertent or accidental releases of hazardous substances transported on adjacent roadways or rail lines near the site. (p. 4.8-28)

4.8-11: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (p. 4.8-29)

4.8-12: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (p. 4.8-29)

Hydrology and Water Quality

4.9-1: The proposed CCSP could degrade water quality during construction. (p. 4.9-18)

4.9-2: Operation of the proposed CCSP could generate new sources of polluted runoff. (p. 4.9-20)

4.9-3: The proposed CCSP could expose people or property to an increased risk of flood hazards. (p. 4.9-21)

4.9-4: The proposed CCSP could adversely affect groundwater supplies, groundwater quality, and/or interfere with groundwater recharge. (p. 4.9-22)

4.9-5: The proposed CCSP could contribute to the cumulative degradation of water quality. (p. 4.9-23)

4.9-6: The proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in the risk of flooding. (p. 4.9-23)

4.9-7: The proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative impact on groundwater supplies, quality, and recharge. (p. 4.9-24)

Noise and Vibration

4.10-3: The operation of development allowed under the proposed CCSP could result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater. (p. 4.10-26)

4.10-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative increases in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or greater. (p. 4.10-38)

Public Services

4.11-1: The proposed CCSP would increase demand for police protection services within the City of Sacramento. (p. 4.11-7)

4.11-2: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development in the City of Sacramento, would contribute to cumulative increase in the demand for police protection services. (p. 4.11-8)

4.11-3: The proposed CCSP would increase the demand for fire protection services. (p. 4.11-16)

4.11-4: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development within the boundaries of the City of Sacramento, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for fire protection services. (p. 4.11-18)

4.11-5: The proposed CCSP would generate additional students in Sacramento City Unified School District. (p. 4.11-29)

4.11-6: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in student enrollment in Sacramento City Unified School District. (p. 4.11-30)

4.11-7: The proposed CCSP could cause existing parks within the CCSP area to physically deteriorate, requiring additional parks to be constructed. (p. 4.11-44)

Transportation

4.12-1: The proposed CCSP could increase Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). (p. 4.12-44)

4.12-2: The proposed CCSP could worsen intersection operations. (p. 4.12-50)

4.12-4: The proposed CCSP could worsen freeway off-ramp queueing. (p. 4.12-59)

4.12-5: The proposed CCSP could impact pedestrian facilities. (p. 4.12-60)

4.12-6: The proposed CCSP could impact transit facilities. (p. 4.12-61)

4.12-7: The proposed CCSP could impact bicycle facilities. (p. 4.12-64)

4.12-8: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT). (p. 4.12-65)

4.12-9: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts to intersection operations. (p. 4.12-66)

4.12-11: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts to freeway off-ramp queueing. (p. 4.12-77)

4.12-12: The proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could impact pedestrian facilities. (p. 4.12-78)

4.12-13: The proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could impact transit facilities. (p. 4.12-79)

4.12-14: The proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could impact bicycle facilities. (p. 4.12-81)

Utilities

4.13-2: The proposed CCSP would increase demand for wastewater treatment. (p. 4.13-12)

4.13-4: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for wastewater treatment capacity at the SRWWTP. (p. 4.13-14)

4.13-5: The proposed CCSP would increase demand for potable water. (p. 4.13-29)

4.13-6: The proposed CCSP could require additional water conveyance and treatment. (p. 4.13-30)

4.13-8 (incorrectly referenced as 4.11-8 in Table S-1): Implementation of the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for water conveyance in the vicinity of the CCSP areas. (p. 4.13-36)

4.13-9: The collection or disposal of additional solid waste generated under the proposed CCSP would result in adverse physical environmental effects. (p. 4.13-41)

4.13-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in solid waste. (p. 4.13-43)

B. Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.

The following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the projects, including cumulative impacts, are being mitigated to a less-than-significant level and are set out below. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of CEQA and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, as to each such impact, the City Council, based on the evidence in the record before it, finds that changes or alterations incorporated into the projects by means of conditions or otherwise, mitigate, avoid or substantially lessen to a level of insignificance these significant or potentially significant environmental impacts of the projects. The basis for the finding for each identified impact is set forth below.

Aesthetics, Light and Glare

No potential impacts to Aesthetics, Light and Glare were evaluated in the Draft EIR as having a potentially significant impact conclusion and requiring mitigation.

Air Quality

4.2-2: Construction of development under the proposed CCSP could result in short-term emissions of NOx, PM10 and PM2.5. (p. 4.2-21)

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.2-2(a)

For any development project within the CCSP area that would involve excavation, grading, or site preparation that would expose soil, the applicant shall comply with all applicable Rules of the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and shall include the required SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans.

4.2-2(b)

Prior to the issuance of a demolition or building permit for major development projects in the CCSP area, each project shall be screened for construction emissions based on the then-current screening criteria established by the SMAQMD. If the project emissions fall within the limit of the screening criteria no further action is required.

If the project exceeds the screening criteria the applicant shall model emissions for the project. If the emissions fall below the thresholds of significance for construction air emissions no further action is required.

If the air emissions model reflects emissions above the thresholds for construction emissions, the applicant shall mitigate such emissions consistent with applicable rules and procedures of the SMAQMD and City of Sacramento. This includes the following:

The applicant shall include on all grading or improvement plans the following SMAQMD Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices:

- Provide a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the proposed CCSP to the City and the SMAQMD. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The construction*

contractor shall provide the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. This information shall be submitted at least four business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the proposed CCSP, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs.

- Provide a plan in conjunction with the equipment inventory, approved by the SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.*
- Emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site shall not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.*
- If at the time of granting of each building permit, the SMAQMD has adopted a regulation applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation may completely or partially replace this mitigation. Consultation with the SMAQMD prior to construction will be necessary to make this determination.*

The applicant shall include the following SMAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans:

- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil.*

- *Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.*
- *Install wind breaks (e.g., plant trees, solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas.*
- *Plant vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.*
- *Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.*
- *Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust and road dust carryout onto public roads.*
- *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the District shall also be visible to ensure compliance.*

The applicant shall estimate and quantify the construction emissions of NOx. The applicant shall pay into the SMAQMD's construction mitigation fund to offset construction-generated emissions of NOx that exceed SMAQMD's daily emission threshold of 85 ppd. The applicants shall keep track of actual equipment use and their NOx emissions so that mitigation fees can be adjusted accordingly for payment to the SMAQMD.

Finding: With implementation of the above mitigation measures, fugitive dust would be controlled, exhaust emissions would be reduced on-site, and mitigation fees would be provided to SMAQMD for project NOx emissions that exceed the SMAQMD significance threshold. SMAQMD uses the fees to fund off-site projects and programs that would offset the project's NOx emissions.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4

4.2-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in short-term (construction) emissions. (p. 4.2-33)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.2-7

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) and (b).

Finding: With implementation of the above mitigation measure for the proposed CCSP, cumulative increases in short-term (construction) emissions would be reduced. Fugitive dust would be controlled, exhaust emissions would be reduced on-site, and mitigation fees would be provided to SMAQMD for project NOx emissions that exceed the SMAQMD significance threshold. SMAQMD uses the fees to fund off-site projects and programs that would offset the project's NOx emissions. Although cumulative NOx emissions in the SVAB would be significant due to existing violations in the region, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) and (b) the proposed CCSP contributions would be reduced to a level that would result in a less-than-considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Biological Resources

4.3-2: Development under the proposed CCSP could result in the loss of potential nesting habitat for special-status bird species and other sensitive and/or protected bird species. (p. 4.3-47)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-2(a)

For projects proposed to be constructed in the CCSP area that have trees onsite or trees immediately adjacent to the project site (including within a planter strip), the applicant shall conduct a nesting bird survey to determine whether there are nesting special-status birds present. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to and within 14 days of construction activities. If nesting birds are present during the survey, then the applicant shall notify the City's Planning Director and proceed as follows:

- 1) The applicant shall conduct any tree removal activities required for project construction outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31) where feasible.*
- 2) All trees slated for removal during the nesting season shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist no more than 48-hours before removal to ensure that no nesting birds are occupying the tree.*

- 3) *Depending on conditions specific to each nest, and the relative location and rate of construction activities, it may be feasible for construction to occur as planned without impacting the breeding season. In this case (to be determined on an individual basis), the nest(s) shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during excavation and other outdoor construction that involves the use of heavy equipment. If, in the professional opinion of the monitor, the construction activities associated with that part of construction activities would impact the nest, the monitor shall immediately inform the construction manager and the applicant shall notify the City's Planning Director. The construction manager shall stop construction activities that have the potential to adversely affect the nest until the nest is no longer active. Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by a qualified biologist. If construction begins outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), then the applicant is permitted to continue construction activities through the breeding season.*
- 4) *The applicant shall maintain a 100-ft buffer around each active purple martin nest. No construction activities are permitted within this buffer.*
- 5) *For other migratory birds, a no-work buffer zone shall be established around the active nest in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The no-work buffer may vary depending on species and site-specific conditions as determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.*

4.3-2(b)

For projects proposed to be constructed in the CCSP area that would include the use of off-road vehicles during project construction, the applicant shall conduct a survey for Swainson's hawk nests, the survey shall be of all trees within 500 feet of the project site which has a 24-inch minimum diameter at breast height. The survey distance may be decreased based on type of construction and whether heavy construction equipment would be used. The applicant may ask the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for a reduced survey distance and/or reduced buffer area. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee's Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (2000). If active Swainson's hawk nests or other raptors' nests are found during the survey performed under Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a), construction activities shall not be permitted on those portions of the project site within 500 feet of the active nest during the Swainson's hawk breeding season (March 1 – September 15).

4.3-2(c)

For projects proposed within suitable habitat for burrowing owl (in particular for projects proposed in annual grassland habitat occurring in the northeast part of the CCSP area as shown in Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR, and areas adjacent to Sutter's Landing Park that have not been developed), the applicant shall conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls in accordance with guidance from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a), (b), and (c) would reduce impacts to nesting birds by requiring preconstruction surveys to identify any nesting birds, and if found, observing no-disturbance zones around nest sites, and therefore would reduce the impact to nesting birds during construction of development under the proposed CCSP to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-4: Projects proposed under the CCSP could result in removal of habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. (p. 4.3-52)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-4(a)

For projects proposed within or adjacent to habitat for VELB (suitable habitat for the VELB occurs in close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers in association with undeveloped valley foothill riparian habitat and at undeveloped areas of Sutter's Landing Park; see Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR), the applicant shall conduct surveys prior to construction for the presence of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its elderberry host plant by a qualified biologist in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocols. If elderberry plants with stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater are not identified, no further mitigation is required.

4.3-4(b)

If elderberry plants with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level occur on or adjacent to and within 100 feet of ground disturbing activities (shrub's dripline is within 100 feet of construction activities or site), or are otherwise located where they may be directly or indirectly affected by the project, minimization and compensation measures, which include transplanting existing shrubs and planting replacement habitat (conservation plantings) are required (see below). Surveys are valid for a period of two years. Elderberry plants with no stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level are unlikely to be habitat for the beetle because of their small size and/or

immaturity. Therefore, no minimization measures are required for removal of elderberry plants with all stems measuring 1.0 inch or less in diameter at ground level.

4.3-4(c)

For shrubs with stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater, the applicant shall ensure that elderberry shrubs within 100 feet of ground disturbing activities be protected and/or compensated for (if affected by construction activities) in accordance with the “U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services’ (USFWS) Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle and the Programmatic Formal Consultation Permitting Projects with Relatively Small Effects on the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office.”

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(a), (b), and (c), elderberry shrubs would be protected and any shrubs that require removal would be compensated for. As a result, the proposed CCSP would not cause a reduction in VELB habitat. Thus, impacts to VELB from implementation of the proposed CCSP would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-6: Projects developed under the proposed CCSP could result in impacts to special-status bat species. (p. 4.3-54)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-6

If a project would result in the removal of large, mature trees within the riparian areas along the Sacramento or American rivers as shown on Figure 4.3-1 of the EIR or the removal of an unsealed, open to the elements, vacant building, and construction activities commence on the project site during the breeding season of special-status bat species (May 1 to August 31), then a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether active roosts are present on site or within 100 feet of the project boundaries prior to the commencement of construction activities. Field surveys shall be conducted early in the breeding season before any construction activities begin, when bats are establishing maternity roosts but before pregnant females give birth (April through early May). If no roosting bats are found, then no further mitigation is required.

If roosting bats are found, then disturbance of the maternity roosts shall be avoided by halting construction until the end of the breeding season. Alternatively, a qualified bat biologist may exclude the roosting bats in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, thereby allowing construction to continue after successful exclusion activities.

If the biologist determines that bats could potentially inhabit a building planned for demolition or alteration, and a nighttime survey is necessary, then the biologist may return for an emergence survey.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-6(a), (b), and (c) would minimize potential direct and indirect impacts on maternity roosting bats within the CCSP area by requiring preconstruction surveys to identify any maternity roosting sites within 100 feet of project activities, and if found, observance of no-disturbance zones around those sites. This would reduce impacts to maternity colonies during construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-8: Projects developed pursuant to the CCSP could result in net reduction of sensitive habitats including protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands. (p. 4.3-56)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-8(a)

For projects proposed in areas that contain aquatic habitat which may support wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands (i.e., riparian or riverine areas associated with the Sacramento and American rivers as shown on Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR), the applicant shall conduct a formal aquatic resources delineation within those project sites. The aquatic resources delineation shall be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for verification. If jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, is required.

4.3-8(b)

If jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands are present, the applicant shall avoid them if feasible. The applicant shall minimize disturbances and construction footprints near avoided wetlands and other waters of the

U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands to the extent feasible.

4.3-8(c)

If avoidance of wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands are not feasible, then the applicant shall demonstrate that there is no net loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands through compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404 requirements.

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), (b), and (c) there would be no net loss of wetlands and potential indirect impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands would be avoided or mitigated to the extent feasible. Thus, impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands from implementation of the projects developed under the proposed CCSP would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in removal of protected street trees and conflict with local policies protecting trees. (p. 4.3-60)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-10

For any project within the CCSP area that would remove protected trees as defined by City Code 12.56, the applicant shall submit a tree removal permit application for the removal of protected trees and comply with all conditions of any issued permit.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-10 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level through compliance with the City's established requirements to avoid or mitigate for the loss of protected trees.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-11: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative harm to, or

loss of nesting habitat, for nesting habitat for special-status bird species and other sensitive and/or protected bird species. (p. 4.3-61)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-11

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-11 and compliance with applicable federal, State, and local policies and regulations, the proposed CCSP's contribution to the regional cumulative impact on nesting birds and their habitat would be less than considerable, and the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-13: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. (p. 4.3-63)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-13

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(a), 4.3-4(b), and 4.3-4(c).

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-13 and compliance with applicable federal, State, and local policies and regulations, the proposed CCSP's contribution to the regional cumulative impact on VELB and their habitat would be less than considerable, and this impact would be less than significant.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-14: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of habitat, or impacts to bat species. (p. 4.3-64)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-14

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-6.

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-14, in combination with CDFW riparian vegetation mitigation requirements, the proposed plan's contribution to cumulative impact on bat species within Sacramento County would be reduced. Project-related disturbance to bat species would be less than considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of bats within Sacramento County, and this impact would be less than significant.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.3-15: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of sensitive habitats including protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands. (p. 4.3-65)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.3-15

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-15 would mitigate impacts to wetlands, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands within the CCSP area. This would occur through a combination of restoration/enhancement, and/or purchase of restoration credits to ensure no net loss. By ensuring that projects proposed under the CCSP achieve no net loss of waters of the U.S. or riparian habitat, the contribution of the CCSP to the overall cumulative impact would be less than considerable, and thus the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Energy Demand and Conservation

Finding: No mitigation is required for the identified potential impacts to Energy Demand and Conservation that are evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Finding: No mitigation is required for the identified potential impacts to Geology, Soils, and Seismicity that are evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Global Climate Change

Finding: No mitigation is required for the identified potential impacts to Global Climate Change that are evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

4.8-1: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose people to contaminated soil. (p. 4.8-18)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.8-1

If a development site is listed in the Phase I ESA Overview Study as being of moderate or high potential to have a Recognized Environmental Condition (REC), the applicant shall conduct a site specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment during the entitlement process in general accordance with the current version of ASTM 1527 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process prior to construction and shall comply with the recommendations in the report. Recommendations may include guidance on mitigating hazards from encountering contaminated groundwater, including measures related to disturbance of existing treatment systems, drilling, groundwater extraction, or vapor intrusion.

This requirement does not apply to projects in which excavation would extend no deeper than 18 inches, including projects that are limited to installation of a fence, deck, single-family residence, garage or addition to an existing residence (e.g., room addition), shallow landscaping with or without irrigation lines, or other minor site improvements, or replacement of existing facilities (road signs, sidewalks, pipes, etc.) where ground disturbance would occur principally in previously disturbed sediment.

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8 1 listed above, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the Phase I assessment would identify the presence of potential or actual hazardous materials, which, if identified, would then require further investigation and cleanup in compliance with applicable regulations, if needed.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.8-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts by exposing people to contaminated soil during construction activities. (p. 4.8-26)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.8-7

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7, the Phase I assessment would identify the presence of potential or actual contaminated soil, which if identified, would then require further investigation and cleanup in compliance with applicable regulations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-7 would reduce the cumulative impacts to less than significant.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Noise and Vibration

4.10-4: Construction of buildings pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose existing and/or planned buildings, and persons within, to vibration that could disturb people or damage buildings. (p. 4.10-27)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-4(a)

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.

4.10-4(b)

For all projects in the CCSP area that require the use of graders or impact pile drivers:

Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or building permit, the applicant shall develop and submit a Vibration Reduction Plan to the City Chief Building Official for approval. The Plan shall include measures that will reduce vibration at surrounding buildings to less than 80 VdB and 83

VdB where people sleep and work, respectively, and less than 0.25 PPV for historic buildings. Measures and controls shall be identified based on project-specific final design plans, and may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following:

- 1) Inclusion of buffers and selection of equipment to minimize vibration impacts during construction at nearby receptors in order to meet the specified standards.*
- 2) Implementation of a vibration, crack, and line and grade monitoring program at existing Nationally registered, State listed, and locally recognized historic buildings located within 47 feet of construction activities. The following elements shall be included in this program:*
 - i. Prior to start of construction:*
 - 1. The applicant or construction contractor shall install crack gauges on proximate historic structures.*
 - ii. During building construction:*
 - 1. The construction contractor shall regularly inspect and photograph crack gauges, maintaining records of these inspections to be included in post-construction reporting. Gauges shall be inspected every two weeks, or more frequently during periods of active project actions in close proximity to crack gauges.*
 - 2. The construction contractor shall collect vibration data from receptors and report vibration levels to the City Chief Building Official on a monthly basis. The reports shall include annotations regarding project activities as necessary to explain changes in vibration levels, along with proposed corrective actions to avoid vibration levels approaching or exceeding the established threshold.*
 - 3. If vibration levels exceed the threshold and monitoring or inspection indicates that the project is damaging the historic structure, additional protection or stabilization shall be implemented. If necessary and with approval by the City Chief Building Official, the construction contractor shall install temporary shoring or stabilization to help avoid permanent impacts. Stabilization may involve structural reinforcement or corrections for deterioration that would minimize or avoid potential structural failures or avoid accelerating damage to the historic structure. Stabilization shall be conducted following the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. This*

treatment shall ensure retention of the historical resource's character-defining features. Stabilization may temporarily impair the historic integrity of the building's design, material, or setting, and as such, the stabilization must be conducted in a manner that will not permanently impair a building's ability to convey its significance. Measures to shore or stabilize the building shall be installed in a manner that avoids damage to the historic integrity of the building, including integrity of material.

iii. Post-construction:

- 1. At the conclusion of vibration generating construction activities, the applicant shall submit a crack and vibration monitoring report to the City Chief Building Official. The report shall include: a narrative summary of the monitoring activities and their findings; photographs illustrating the post-construction state of cracks and material conditions that were presented in the pre-construction assessment report; annotated analysis of vibration data related to project activities; a summary of measures undertaken to avoid vibration impacts; a post-construction line and grade survey; and photographs of other relevant conditions showing the impact, or lack of impact, of project activities. The photographs shall be of sufficient detail to illustrate damage, if any, caused by the project and/or show how the project did not cause physical damage to the historic and non-historic buildings.*
- 2. The applicant shall be responsible for repairs from damage to historic and non-historic buildings if damage is caused by vibration or movement during the demolition and/or construction activities. Repairs may be necessary to address, for example, cracks that expanded as a result of the project, physical damage visible in post-construction assessment, or holes or connection points that were needed for shoring or stabilization. Repairs shall be limited to project impacts and do not apply to general rehabilitation or restoration activities of the buildings. If necessary for historic structures, repairs shall be conducted in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. The applicant shall provide a work plan for the repairs and a completion report to ensure compliance with the SOI Standards to the City Chief Building Official and City Preservation Director for review and comment.*

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 would ensure that construction activities within the CCSP area would not result in building damage at the nearest historic building structures, and would reduce human disturbance to the extent feasible. Therefore, implementation of Migration Measure 4.10-4(a)

and Mitigation Measure 4.10(b) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Public Services

4.11-8: The proposed CCSP could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities or the need for new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for parks and recreation services. (p. 4.11-45)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.11-8

Projects within the CCSP area shall comply with the City's Quimby and Park Impact Fees (PIF) ordinances.

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.11-8 would ensure that City park standards reflective of urban residential needs are met through dedication of parks and open space and the payment of in-lieu fees. Consistent with General Plan Policy ERC 2.2.6, this mitigation measure allows the City to consider the urban nature of the CCSP area, as well as the recreational value of project elements that are not typical parks.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.11-9: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in the physical deterioration of existing CCSP area parks, requiring additional parks to be provided. (p. 4.11-46)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.11-8

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.11-9 would ensure that City park standards reflective of urban residential needs are met through dedication of parks and open space and the payment of in-lieu fees. The City would use in-lieu fees from these developments and other residential development projects to fund parks and recreational facilities as needed throughout the community, including regional parks, as indicated by the PRMP and applicable City policies.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.11-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in the substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities or the need for new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for parks and recreation services. (p. 4.11-47)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.11-10

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.11-10 would ensure that City park standards reflective of urban residential needs are met through dedication of parks and open space and the payment of in-lieu fees. The City would use in-lieu fees from these developments and other residential development projects to fund parks and recreational facilities as needed throughout the community, including regional parks, as indicated by the PRMP and applicable City policies.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation

4.12-3: The proposed CCSP could worsen freeway operations. (p. 4.12-58)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.12-3

Each project developed pursuant to the CCSP, and subject to mitigation measures of the CCSP EIR, that generates more than 100 vehicular AM or PM peak hour trips that are directed toward the highway system shall:

- *Remit monetary payment to the I-5 Freeway Subregional Corridor Mitigation Program (SCMP). This remittance shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits.*

OR

- *Negotiate a mutually acceptable agreement with Caltrans and the City.*

Projects in the CCSP area that would be exempt from the implementation of this measure include projects not subject to CEQA (Public Resources Code (PRC) §21080(b)), projects that are categorically exempt from CEQA or projects eligible for statutory streamlining including but not limited to qualified housing projects (PRC §§21159.21 and 21159.24), affordable low-income housing projects (PRC §21159.23), and qualifying infill developments (PRC §21094.5 and State CEQA Guidelines §15332), as well as projects that are not required to address specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips generated by the project on the regional transportation network (PRC §21159.28).

Finding: On April 5, 2016, the City approved the I-5 SCMP and certified its Supplemental EIR (SCH #2011012081). The SCMP would reduce auto travel on study area freeways by providing funding towards a diverse list of multimodal transportation improvement projects, including a new bridge across the American River, two new bridges across the Sacramento River, a streetcar system that would serve the study area, and new high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on I-5.

The SCMP provides the option for development projects to monetarily contribute to the program, which would constitute mitigation for a project's impacts to the area's freeway system. To reduce the Plan's freeway impacts shown in Table 4.12-11, the Plan would participate in the SCMP through Mitigation Measure 4.12-3. As stated in Resolution 2016-0109, certain projects would be exempt from the I-5 Subregional Corridor Mitigation Fee Program; projects that are statutorily or categorically exempt from CEQA would also be exempt from the fee program. Therefore, the Plan would not have significant impacts to freeway facilities in the area.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.12-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts to freeway operations. (p. 4.12-76)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.12-10

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-3.

Finding: On April 5, 2016, the City approved the I-5 SCMP and certified its Supplemental EIR (SCH #2011012081). The SCMP would reduce auto travel on study area freeways by providing funding towards a diverse list of multimodal transportation improvement projects, including a new bridge across the American River, two new bridges across the Sacramento River, a streetcar system that would serve the study area, and new HOV lanes on I-5. The SCMP provides the option for development projects to monetarily contribute to the program, which would constitute mitigation for a project's impacts to the area's freeway system. To reduce the Plan's freeway impacts shown in Table 4.12 15, the Plan would participate in the SCMP through Mitigation Measure 4.12-3. Therefore, the Plan would not have cumulatively considerable impacts to freeway facilities in the area.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Utilities

4.13-1: The proposed CCSP would discharge additional flows to the City's sewer and drainage systems, which could exceed existing infrastructure capacity. (p. 4.13-11)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.13-1

The City shall manage wastewater from the CCSP such that it shall not exceed existing CSS capacity by implementing the following methods:

- a) Project applicants within the CCSP area shall pay the established CSS mitigation fee.*
- b) For projects within the CCSP area that require localized upsizing of existing CSS infrastructure for service, applicants shall pay their fair*

share for improvements to upsize or upgrade the CSS infrastructure. A separate cost sharing agreement may be executed between applicants and the City for this option.

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 would require the implementation of measures to manage wastewater, drainage and dewatered groundwater flows in a manner that would not exceed existing capacity of the CSS and Basin 52 systems.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.13-3: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for wastewater and stormwater facilities. (p. 4.13-13)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.13-3

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.13-1.

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 would fully offset the project contribution to the sewer and wastewater systems by requiring that the applicant construct appropriate facilities to delay discharge of wastewater, groundwater and/or stormwater or pay the applicable fee to the City to make necessary localized or system-wide improvements.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

C. Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts for which Mitigation Measures Are Found To Be Infeasible.

Mitigation measures to mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen the following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the project have been identified. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, as to each such impact and mitigation measure, the City Council, based on the evidence in the record before it, specifically finds that the mitigation measures are infeasible. The impact and mitigation measures and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each mitigation measure are set forth below. Notwithstanding the disclosure of these impacts and the finding of infeasibility, the City Council elects to approve the projects due to the overriding considerations set forth below in Section F, the statement of overriding considerations.

Air Quality

4.2-3: Development under the proposed CCSP could result in long-term (operational) emissions of NOx, ROG, PM10, and PM2.5. (p. 4.10-26)

4.2-8: The proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in long-term (operational) emissions of NOx, ROG, PM10, and PM2.5. (p. 4.10-34)

Finding: No feasible mitigation strategies have been identified to reduce the long-term (operational) emissions of NOx, ROG, PM10, and PM2.5.

For these reasons, mitigation to reduce the long-term (operational) emissions of NOx, ROG, PM10, and PM2.5. is infeasible and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

D. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.

The following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the project, including cumulative impacts, are unavoidable and cannot be mitigated in a manner that would lessen the significant impact to below the level of significance. Notwithstanding disclosure of these impacts, the City Council elects to approve the project due to overriding considerations as set forth below in Section F, the statement of overriding considerations.

Air Quality

4.2-5 (Operation): Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in short-term and long-term exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants. (p. 4.2-29)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.2-5

The City shall require implementation of the following mitigation measures as part of approval of any residences in the CCSP area within 500 feet of Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5:

- *Locate sensitive receptors as far as possible from Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5.*
- *Provide vegetative barriers between the source and receptors. Guidance from the US EPA's July 2016 Recommendations for Constructing Roadside Vegetation Barriers to Improve Near-Road*

Air Quality or Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Landscaping Guidance for Improving Air Quality near Roadways may be incorporated.

Finding: The evaluation of health risks from TAC represents a local rather than regional analysis. The qualitative discussion in Impact 4.2-5 shows that TACs and resulting health risks produced during construction of the CCSP would result in a less-than-significant impact. Impact 4.2-5 also includes an evaluation of the TAC emissions generated during the operation of the CCSP, which concluded that any sources of onsite TAC emissions would be regulated through the SMAQMD permitting process, and the CCSP's contribution would be less than significant. However, TAC emissions generated by vehicles on Business 80, Highway 50 and I-5 could adversely affect future residents. The qualitative discussion in Impact 4.2-5 concluded that future proposed residences would be placed within the SMAQMD's health risk screening distance of 500 feet of Business 80, Highway 50 and I-5 resulting in a significant impact. Portions of the CCSP area are within 500 feet of a freeway, and the CCSP's contribution to residents' exposure is cumulatively considerable.

Significance after Mitigation: Mitigation Measure 4.2-5 would reduce the exposure of future residents to TAC emissions. However, since residences could be less than 500 feet from Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5, future residents would be exposed to mobile source TAC emissions.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

4.2-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in short- and long-term exposures to Toxic Air Contaminants. (p. 4.10-36)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.2-10

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-5.

Finding: The evaluation of health risks from TAC represents a local rather than regional analysis. The qualitative discussion in Impact 4.2-5 shows that TACs and resulting health risks produced during construction of the CCSP would result in a less-than-significant impact. Impact 4.2-5 also includes an evaluation of the TAC emissions generated during the operation of the CCSP, which concluded that any sources of onsite TAC emissions would be regulated through the SMAQMD permitting process, and the CCSP's contribution would be less than significant. However, TAC emissions generated by vehicles on Business 80, Highway 50 and I-5 could adversely affect future residents. The qualitative

discussion in Impact 4.2-5 concluded that future proposed residences would be placed within the SMAQMD's health risk screening distance of 500 feet of Business 80, Highway 50 and I-5 resulting in a significant impact. Regionally, there are many residential areas that are adjacent to high volume roadways and freeways, exposing residents to TAC. Portions of the CCSP area are within 500 feet of a freeway, and the CCSP's contribution to residents' exposure is cumulatively considerable.

Significance after Mitigation: Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 would reduce the exposure of future residents to TAC emissions. However, since residences could be less than 500 feet from Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5, future residents would be exposed to mobile source TAC emissions.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Cultural Resources

4.4-1: New construction in the proposed CCSP area could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including human remains. (p. 4.4-29)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.4-1(a)

Unanticipated Discovery Protocol for Archaeological Resources and Human Remains

If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during any stage of construction for any project in the CCSP area, all ground disturbing activities shall halt within the project property up to 100 feet from the location of the discovery and the City shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials include, for example, obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Any tribal cultural resources discovered during project work shall be immediately disclosed to the City and treated in consultation with the Native American monitor on site, if applicable, or with Native American representatives, with the goal of preserving in place with proper treatment. Historic-period materials may include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. A qualified archaeologist, defined as one meeting the Secretary of the Interior's

Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology, shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery. If the City determines that an archaeological resource qualifies as a historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or tribal cultural resource (as defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines) and that the project has potential to damage or destroy the resource, the following shall be implemented:

- 1) If the resource has an association with Native Americans, the City shall consult with appropriate Native American Tribal Representatives and a qualified archaeologist to determine the appropriate mitigation. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means: (1) modifying the construction plan to avoid the resource; (2) incorporating the resource within open space; (3) capping and covering the resource before building appropriate facilities on the resource site; or (4) deeding resource site into a permanent conservation easement. Consultation between the City, Native American Tribal Representatives, and a qualified archaeologist may result in alternative means of preservation for archaeological resources and/or tribal cultural resources associated with Native Americans.*
- 2) If the resource does not have an association with Native Americans, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), mitigation shall be accomplished through either preservation in place or, if preservation in place is not feasible, data recovery through excavation. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means: (1) modifying the construction plan to avoid the resource; (2) incorporating the resource within open space; (3) capping and covering the resource before building appropriate facilities on the resource site; or (4) deeding resource site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan to recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to any excavation at the resource site. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the Project. The treatment plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved*

facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.

- 3) In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project implementation, project construction activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease until the Sacramento County Coroner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. The City shall comply with requirements identified by the NAHC for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[d]).*

4.4-1(b)

Identification of Sensitive Areas

The City, based on input from Native American consultation, shall prepare a map of the CCSP area identifying previously recorded archaeological resources and potential locations of tribal cultural resources—these areas to be collectively known as “sensitive areas”—for use by the City, applicant, archaeologist and Native American monitor. The map shall be subject to California law regarding confidentiality of such materials.

4.4-1(c)

Worker Training and Archaeological Monitoring of Project Ground-Disturbing Activities in Sensitive Areas

The provisions of this mitigation measure shall not be required for projects in sensitive areas that consist of: 1) replacement of existing facilities (road signs, sidewalks, pipes, etc.) where ground disturbance would occur principally in previously disturbed sediment, or 2) minor levels of ground disturbance (e.g., to no more than 18 inches below surface). For all other projects in the CCSP area that are within sensitive areas:

- 1) Construction worker cultural resources awareness training shall be conducted for construction personnel involved with excavation activities where ground disturbance would be greater than 18 inches below the ground surface. The training shall consist of a preconstruction training session conducted by or under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist, defined as one meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology, and shall be held for all construction personnel and staff involved with excavation activities. The training may be delivered to applicable construction personnel via an electronic format (DVD or video file, for example). Training content will cover procedures to be followed and appropriate conduct to be adhered*

to if archaeological materials, including tribal cultural resources, are encountered during the project work. Training will include:

- a) Purpose of archaeological monitoring;*
 - b) Identifying archaeological resources; and*
 - c) Maintaining proper discovery protocols during construction.*
- 2) Excavation work within the areas identified as sensitive areas shall be undertaken in a manner that is responsive to the potential for discovery of resources. The applicant, archaeologist, and tribal monitor shall coordinate in implementing construction techniques. In the event of dispute, the City's Director of Community Development shall be consulted and shall determine the appropriate procedures at the site.*
- 3) An archaeologist meeting, or supervised by an archaeologist meeting, the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archeology, shall monitor all project ground-disturbing activities within the sensitive areas agreed upon by the City and Native American Tribal Representatives. Information regarding the location of ground disturbing activities and any resource finds shall be kept on file at the City. Such monitoring and reporting shall be conducted at the applicant's expense.*
- 4) A Native American monitor shall be employed at the applicant's expense to conduct monitoring of project construction activities for sensitive areas. The conduct and work of any Native American monitor shall be consistent with the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Guidelines for Native American Monitors/Consultants.*
- 5) Potential tribal cultural resources discovered during project work shall be treated in consultation with the Native American monitor on site.*
- 6) If discovery is made of items of potential archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources, the procedures set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) shall be followed.*

Finding: Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(a) through 4.4-1(c) address the training of construction crew, archaeological construction monitoring, and discovery of unanticipated archaeological resources, and would apply to all future proposed projects within the CCSP area. Implementation of the mitigation measures would lessen potential project impacts to prehistoric and historic-period archaeological resources by increasing the likelihood that previously unidentified archaeological resources and human remains are protected. However, because the presence of

potentially significant archaeological resources, including human remains, may not be known until the resource is disturbed during project-related ground-disturbing activities, damage may occur prior to the discovery of such resources; such damage could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including human remains, and would be considered a significant impact. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.4-2: New construction in the CCSP area could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. (p. 4.4-33)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.4-2

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).

Finding: With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(a) through 4.4-1(c), addresses the training of construction crew, archaeological construction monitoring, and discovery of unanticipated archaeological resources, and would apply to all future proposed projects within the CCSP area. Implementation of the mitigation measures would lessen potential project impacts to tribal cultural resources that may be archaeological resources by increasing the likelihood that previously unidentified archaeological resources and human remains are protected. However, because the presence of buried archaeological resources, including human remains, that may be tribal cultural resources may not be known until the resource is disturbed during project-related ground-disturbing activities, damage may occur prior to the discovery of such resources; such damage could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource and would be considered a significant impact. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.4-4: New construction in the proposed CCSP area, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to the cumulative loss or alteration of archaeological resources, including human remains. (p. 4.4-35)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.4-4

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 would ensure that existing archaeological resources are identified, evaluated and treated promptly before they can be damaged or destroyed during construction. However, as noted above, archaeological resources are finite. As such, the loss of this material record cannot be completely mitigated. Therefore, the project's potential contribution to this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

With implementation of the mitigation measure(s), this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Noise and Vibration

4.10-1: Construction of development allowed under the proposed CCSP could generate noise that would conflict with City standards or result in substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. (p. 4.10-17)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-1

For all projects in the CCSP area that require a building permit, the City shall require that the contractor implement the following measures during all phases of construction:

- a) All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall have manufacturer-installed mufflers.*
- b) Auger displacement shall be used for installation of foundation piles, if feasible. If impact pile driving is required, sonic pile drivers shall be used, unless engineering studies are submitted to the City that show this is not feasible, based on geotechnical considerations.*

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would reduce construction noise within the CCSP area to the extent feasible. Restricting heavy-duty equipment operations in close proximity to buildings would substantially reduce exterior and interior noise at adjacent buildings. Use of auger displacement would reduce noise levels of pile installation to be comparable to the existing noise levels of passing trains. If auger displacement is not feasible, use of sonic pile drivers would reduce noise levels by about 5 dB compared to impact pile drivers. These measures would minimize interior noise and

associated sleep disturbance and any potential hearing loss effects at nearby receptors during excavation, and construction. After implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, this impact would be reduced in magnitude, but because site conditions may make it infeasible to implement all measures identified above.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

4.10-2: Operations of development allowed under the proposed CCSP could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient exterior noise levels. (p. 4.10-20)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-2

For development of new commercial or mixed-use buildings within the CCSP area, the applicant shall demonstrate that noise levels from HVAC and/or loading docks would not exceed the stationary noise standards established in the City's Code. To demonstrate that a proposed development will meet the City's stationary noise standards, the developer must implement the following measures:

- a) Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit engineering and acoustical specification for project mechanical HVAC equipment and the proposed locations of onsite loading docks to the Planning Director demonstrating that the HVAC equipment and loading dock design (types, location, enclosure, specification) will control noise from the equipment to at least 10 dB below existing ambient levels at nearby residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.*
- b) Noise-generating stationary equipment associated with proposed commercial and/or office uses, including portable generators, compressors, and compactors shall be enclosed or acoustically shielded to reduce noise-related impacts to noise-sensitive residential uses.*

Finding: No feasible mitigation strategies have been identified to reduce the on-road transportation noise impacts to less than significant. Alternative modes of transportation (i.e., walking, biking, and transit) are already accounted for in the above traffic noise estimates. The reduction in roadway traffic volumes needed to mitigate these roadway noise impacts is not feasible for the proposed CCSP. In addition, typical measures to reduce roadway noise impacts, such as noise walls, setbacks, and rubberized asphalt, are not considered feasible mitigation for development in the urban core of the City. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impacts of non-transportation noise sources (i.e., HVAC units and loading docks), with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-2, would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. As a result, impacts associated with HVAC and loading dock noise would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

For these reasons the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

4.10-5: Implementation of the proposed CCSP would result in exposure of people to cumulative increases in construction noise levels. (p. 4.10-32)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-5

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-5 would reduce the contribution of the CCSP to cumulative construction noise levels at the existing and future planned noise sensitive land uses located within the CCSP area. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-5 listed above, the contribution of the CCSP to this cumulative impact would be reduced in magnitude, but because site conditions make it infeasible to implement all measures identified in Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, the contribution of the proposed CCSP could remain considerable.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

4.10-6: Operations of development allowed under the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative increases in ambient exterior noise levels. (p. 4.10-32)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-6

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.

Finding: No feasible mitigation strategies have been identified to reduce the on-road transportation noise impacts to less than significant. Alternative modes of transportation (i.e., walking, biking, and transit) are already accounted for in the above traffic noise estimates. The reduction in vehicular use needed to mitigate these roadway noise impacts is not feasible for the CCSP. In addition,

typical measures to reduce roadway noise impacts, such as noise walls, setbacks, and rubberized asphalt, are not considered feasible mitigation for development in the urban core of the City. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-6 would reduce noise impacts related to HVAC equipment and loading docks by requiring HVAC equipment and loading dock design to reduce noise to a less-than-significant level. However, because no feasible mitigation exists to lessen the impact of on-road transportation noise, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

4.10-8: Construction of buildings pursuant to the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative construction that could expose existing and/or planned buildings, and persons within, to significant vibration. (p. 4.10-39)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.10-8

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(b) would ensure that construction activities within the CCSP area would not result in building damage at the nearest historic and non-historic building structures, and would reduce human disturbance to the extent feasible. While implementation of the mitigation measures described above would avoid vibration-caused building damage and would reduce vibration impacts to surrounding receptors, it is reasonable to assume that the combined cumulative construction activities could still adversely affect surrounding sensitive land uses. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-8 listed above, the contribution of the CCSP to this cumulative impact would remain considerable, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Utilities

4.13-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for water supply. (p. 4.13-31)

Mitigation Measure: The following mitigation measure(s) has been adopted to address this impact:

4.13-7

To ensure that sufficient capacity would be available to meet cumulative demands, the City shall implement, to the extent needed in order to secure sufficient supply, one or a combination of the following:

- a. Maximize Water Conservation*
- b. Implement New Water Diversion and/or Treatment Infrastructure*
- c. Implement Additional Groundwater Pumping*

Finding: Mitigation Measure 4.13-7 would result in implementation of water conservation measures by projects in the CCSP, and actions for increasing diversion and treatment capacity. The mitigation requires the City to implement long-term, system-wide measures to secure a sufficient water supply. The timing and location of any diversion and treatment capacity improvements are unknown, nor can the effectiveness of the mitigation be known with certainty.

For these reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

E. Project Alternatives.

The City Council has considered the project alternatives presented and analyzed in the final EIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. Some of these alternatives have the potential to avoid or reduce certain significant or potentially significant environmental impacts, as set forth below. The City Council finds, based on specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, that these alternatives are infeasible. Based on the impacts identified in the Final EIR and other reasons summarized below, and as supported by substantial evidence in the record, the City Council finds that approval and implementation of the Projects as proposed is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action and hereby rejects the other alternatives and other combinations and/or variations of alternatives as infeasible based on consideration of the relevant factors set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, subdivision (f). (See also CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).) Each alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each alternative are set forth below.

Alternatives Considered and Dismissed from Further Consideration

In identifying alternatives to the proposed plan, primary consideration was given to alternatives that could reduce significant unavoidable impacts resulting from the proposed plan while still obtaining the plan's objectives. Certain impacts that are identified as being significant and unavoidable under the proposed plan (e.g., increase in air pollutants from project construction and operation) are due primarily to developing an area that is currently undeveloped or intensifying

development activity beyond current levels. These impacts would not be possible to eliminate, but could be reduced, for example, by limiting the scope of the proposed plan, reconfiguring uses, or implementing mitigation measures. Alternatives that reduce the intensity of development in the CCSP area are addressed later in this chapter.

The following plan alternatives were considered but rejected for the reasons discussed below:

- **No Project/No Development Alternative:** The no project/no development alternative would prevent future growth by prohibiting new development within the CCSP area, establishing a de facto moratorium on development. This alternative was dismissed from consideration because it would be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), which states that “When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the ‘no project’ alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future.”

More importantly, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration because it would fail to meet any of the basic objectives of the CCSP, including to encourage future growth in the City inward into existing urbanized areas. Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would prohibit development of existing vacant or underutilized sites within the CCSP area, which would direct growth into areas outside of the CCSP area. In addition, this alternative would fail to meet the growth projections in the City’s 2035 General Plan or the SACOG MTP/SCS, which envisions high-density residential development in the Central City. As required by State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f), an EIR need examine in detail only the alternatives that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Because this alternative would fail to meet the all of the basic objectives of the CCSP and is inconsistent with the guidance provided by State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), it was dismissed from further consideration.

- **Smaller/Less Growth Alternative:** A smaller/less growth alternative would implement policies that would limit development within the CCSP area to lower levels than have been anticipated for the proposed CCSP, the 2035 General Plan, or the SACOG MTP/SCS growth assumptions. This alternative would tend to reduce several impacts of the proposed CCSP, including construction-related air quality and noise effects on locations in the CCSP area.

However, similar to the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Smaller/Less Growth Alternative would fail to accommodate the amount of growth projected under the 2035 General Plan and SACOG 2016

MTP/SCS, which would tend to push growth outward from the City core into more suburban areas. This growth would result in higher vehicle miles traveled (VMT), relative to the per capita and per employee VMT estimated under the proposed CCSP, and would be inconsistent with CCSP objectives. Concomitant effects triggered by increased per capita and per employee VMT would be increased criteria pollutant emissions and greenhouse gas emissions, increased loss of prime farmland and habitat for special status species, increased water demand, increased energy demand, and the like.

The Smaller/Less Growth Alternative would be inconsistent with some of the most basic objectives of the proposed CCSP, including (1) encouraging growth in the City inward and fostering infill development, (2) protecting important environmental resources and ensuring long-term economic sustainability and health, (3) creating housing in downtown consistent with the 2035 General Plan, and (4) diversifying downtown employment opportunities. Because the Smaller/Less Growth Alternative would fail to meet some of the most basic objectives of the proposed CCSP and would exacerbate a wide range of environmental effects on a regional basis, it was dismissed from further consideration.

- **Larger/Higher Growth Alternative:** The larger/higher growth alternative would implement policies directing development of a substantially higher number of residential units. The larger residential growth proposed by this Alternative would exceed the growth assumptions of the 2035 General Plan and the SACOG 2016 MTP/SCS. For several reasons this alternative was eliminated from further consideration. Housing demand studies undertaken during the preparation did not indicate an available demand to support housing or non-residential development beyond that identified for the proposed CCSP.¹ In addition, this alternative would tend to exacerbate many, if not all, of the environmental impacts disclosed for the proposed CCSP, including all construction-related impacts, criteria and greenhouse gas emissions, traffic congestion, water demand, and related effects. Thus, this alternative would not be consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) which states that an alternative in an EIR

¹ Bay Area Economics, Sacramento Downtown Specific Plan Draft Housing Market Analysis, Phase I and Phase II, November 2016.

must “avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project,” Because the evidence suggests that this alternative would not be economically feasible, would be inconsistent with the 2035 General Plan, and would exacerbate environmental impacts, it was dismissed from further consideration.

- **Transportation Network Option A Alternative:** Transportation Network Option A, considered as part of the Grid 3.0 planning process, evaluated a substantially lower level of investment in transportation improvements relative to the level of investment included as part of the proposed CCSP. Key differences between Option A and the transportation network included in the proposed CCSP are summarized below.

Roadway Network: Transportation Network Option A would include fewer changes to the CCSP area’s existing roadway network. This option would preserve more of the existing system of three-lane one-way roadways, and includes fewer lane reductions and fewer two-way conversions. As described in Section 4.12, lane reductions would be necessary to provide space for additional bicycle facilities and dedicated transit lanes; two-way conversions improve access for bicycles and automobiles, while slowing traffic and improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. More specifically, key differences between Transportation Network Option A and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 5th Street – No two-way conversion between Capitol Mall and Q Street;
- 8th Street – No lane reduction between G Street and P Street;
- 10th Street – No lane reduction between I Street and N Street;
- 15th Street – No lane reduction between G Street and Broadway;
- 16th Street – No lane reduction between N Street and X Street;
- G Street – No two-way conversion between 12th Street and 16th Street;
- H Street – No two-way conversion between 5th Street and 8th Street and no two-way conversion between 12th Street and 16th Street;
- I Street – No lane reduction between 12th Street and 16th Street and no two-way conversion between 16th Street and 21st Street;
- J Street – No lane reduction between 5th Street and 9th Street and no lane reduction between 16th Street and 30th Street;
- L Street – No lane reduction between 11th Street and 15th Street;

- Capitol Mall – No lane reduction between 5th Street and 9th Street;
- N Street – No two-way conversion between 3rd Street and 21st Street (however, this option does include a lane reduction on N Street between 3rd Street and 10th Street); and
- Broadway – No lane reduction between 9th Street and SR-99.

Bicycle Network: Transportation Network Option A would include fewer new on-street bicycle facilities than the proposed CCSP, and no upgrades to existing bicycle facilities to improve safety and comfort for bicyclists. Key differences between Transportation Network Option A and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 10th Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between L Street and N Street;
- 15th Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between C Street and Broadway;
- 16th Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between N Street and X Street;
- H Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 13th Street and 15th Street;
- I Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 12th Street and 21st Street;
- J Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 19th Street and 30th Street;
- N Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 10th Street and 15th Street;
- S Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 13th Street and 21st Street; and
- Broadway – No on-street bicycle lanes between 9th Street and SR-99.

Transit Network: Transportation Network Option A would include fewer transit investments than the proposed CCSP. Key differences between Transportation Network Option A and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 7th Street – No bus stop enhancements between I Street and P Street;

- 8th Street – No dedicated transit lane between G Street and P Street;
- 15th Street – No bus stop enhancements between L Street and N Street;
- J Street – No bus stop enhancements between 9th Street and 12th Street, no dedicated transit lane between 5th Street and 9th Street, and no dedicated transit lane between 16th Street and 19th Street;
- L Street – No dedicated transit lane between 11th Street and 15th Street;
- P Street – No bus stop enhancements between 5th Street and 15th Street; and
- Broadway – No bus stop enhancements/transit investments between 19th Street and 21st Street.

Transportation Network Option A was dismissed from further consideration as it did not meet the basic objective of CCSP to create a connected walk- and transit-first mobility network that serves all modes of travel and supports transit-oriented development including along the Downtown-Riverfront Streetcar line. Because this option would preserve a higher level of automobile capacity, less space would be made available for expanding the network of on-street bikeways and implementing future dedicated transit lanes that would help to increase the percentage of trips made by bicycle and transit, and to accommodate higher levels of trip making within the CCSP area.

Transportation Network Option B Alternative: Transportation Network Option B, originally considered in the Grid 3.0 planning process, included a lower level of investment in transportation improvements relative to the level of investment included as part of the proposed CCSP, although more than included in Network Option A. Key differences between this option and the proposed CCSP are summarized below.

Roadway Network: Transportation Network Option B would include fewer changes to the CCSP area's existing roadway network. This option would preserve more of the existing system of three-lane one-way roadways, and includes fewer lane reductions and fewer two-way conversions. As described in Section 4.12, lane reductions are necessary to provide space for additional bicycle facilities and dedicated transit lanes; two-way conversions improve access for bicycles and automobiles, while slowing traffic and improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

- Key differences between Transportation Network Option B and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 10th Street – No lane reduction between I Street and L Street;
- 15th Street – No lane reduction between G Street and Broadway;
- 16th Street – No lane reduction between N Street and X Street;
- G Street – No two-way conversion between 12th Street and 16th Street;
- H Street – No two-way conversion between 5th Street and 8th Street and no two-way conversion between 12th Street and 16th Street;
- I Street – No lane reduction between 12th Street and 16th Street;
- J Street – No lane reduction between 16th Street and 30th Street;
- L Street – No lane reduction between 11th Street and 15th Street;
- Capitol Mall – No lane reduction between 5th Street and 9th Street;
- N Street – No two-way conversion between 3rd Street and 16th Street (however, this option does include a lane reduction on N Street between 3rd Street and 15th Street); and
- Broadway – No lane reduction between and 21st Street and SR 99.

Bicycle Network: Transportation Network Option B would include fewer new on-street bicycle facilities than the proposed CCSP, and no upgrades to existing bicycle facilities to improve safety and comfort for bicyclists. Key differences between Transportation Network Option B and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 15th Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between C Street and Broadway;
- 16th Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between N Street and X Street;
- H Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 13th Street and 15th Street;
- J Street – No on-street bicycle lanes between 19th Street and 30th Street; and
- Broadway – No on-street bicycle lanes between 21st Street and SR-99.

Transit Network: Transportation Network Option B would include fewer transit investments than the proposed CCSP. Key differences between Transportation Network Option B and the proposed CCSP include the following:

- 7th Street – No bus stop enhancements between I Street and P Street;
- 15th Street – No bus stop enhancements between L Street and N Street;
- J Street – No bus stop enhancements between 9th Street and 12th Street and no dedicated transit lane between 16th Street and 19th Street;
- L Street – No dedicated transit lane between 11th Street and 15th Street;
- P Street – No bus stop enhancements between 5th Street and 15th Street; and
- Broadway – No bus stop enhancements/transit investments between 19th Street and 2^{1st} Street.

Transportation Network Option B was ultimately rejected as an alternative for further consideration as part of the CCSP EIR because it did not meet the basic objective of the CCSP to create a connected walk- and transit-first mobility network that serves all modes of travel and supports transit-oriented development including along the Downtown-Riverfront Streetcar line. Because this option would preserve a higher level of automobile capacity relatively to the proposed CCSP, less space would be made available for expanding the network of on-street bikeways and implementing future dedicated transit lanes that would help to increase the percentage of trips made by bicycle and transit, and to accommodate higher levels of trip making within the CCSP area.

Summary of Alternatives Considered

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or project locations that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a “No Project” alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the project. The range of alternatives to the proposed plan analyzed in the Draft EIR present specific environmental impacts and how they would differ in severity compared to those

associated with the proposed CCSP. For the most part, significant impacts of the alternatives can be mitigated to less than significant levels through adoption of mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4, which contains the environmental analysis of the proposed CCSP. To varying degrees, the following alternatives would also avoid and/or lessen impacts, including some or all of the significant and unavoidable impacts, of the proposed CCSP. The alternatives considered in this section include:

- Alternative 1: No Project/Existing General Plan
- Alternative 2: Reduced Height Alternative
- Alternative 3: Transportation Network Option C Alternative

The evaluation of alternatives is organized to facilitate a clear comparison between the effects of the alternative and the effects of the proposed CCSP. First there is a discussion of those impacts of the alternative that would be the same or similar to those of the proposed CCSP. Then there is a discussion of those effects of the alternative that would be less severe than those of the proposed CCSP, followed by those effects of the alternative that would be more severe than those of the proposed CCSP. Each discussion concludes with a discussion of the relationship between the alternative and the basic objectives of the proposed CCSP.

Alternative 1: No Project/Existing General Plan

Description

Alternative 1, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, assumes that the CCSP area would be subject to infill and redevelopment consistent with the land use designations and allowable uses identified in the existing 2035 General Plan and Central City Community Plan, developed consistent with the guidance of the existing Central City Urban Design Guidelines, and physically located consistent with the assumptions made in the 2035 General Plan Master EIR and the SACOG 2016 MPT/SCS.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed CCSP, because it would maintain the existing mix of uses, transportation network configurations, infrastructure, street lighting, and public art policies. As such, Alternative 1 would fail to achieve the CCSP objective to (1) foster infill development, (2) support the City's Downtown Housing Initiative, (3) maximize livability and quality of life by expanding community amenities, create a connected walk- and transit-first mobility network that serves all modes of travel and supports transit oriented development along the Streetcar line, (4) achieves the goals of the Grid 3.0 planning process, and (5) removes barriers to new housing by streamlining the development and environmental review processes. The CCSP

objectives are intended to improve upon existing conditions, which would be sustained by the No Plan/Existing General Plan Alternative.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

With the CCSP being designed to accommodate growth that would inevitably occur within the Sacramento region, the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in development occurring in a less concentrated way, decreasing densities in proximity to the Streetcar line and major transit stops, and maintaining the existing CCSP area transportation network, with the result being an increase in per capita and per employee VMT. This effect would increase traffic congestion with population growth, leading to higher queuing delays at freeway off-ramps and CCSP area intersections and additional roadway noise. The subsequent air quality impact would be increased carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations within the CCSP area, relative to anticipated CO concentrations under the CCSP.

Under Alternative 1 the planning policies and transportation network proposed in the CCSP would not be approved. The anticipated result would be that Alternative 1 would not result in a concentration of development and a lowering of per capita and per employee VMT, both of which would be anticipated to lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the region under the proposed CCSP. While it is reasonable to assume that development under Alternative 1 would be in compliance with the City's CAP, since per capita and per employee VMT would be higher than under the proposed CCSP, it is also reasonable to conclude that overall levels of GHG emissions would be higher under Alternative 1 than under the proposed CCSP.

Under Alternative 1, facilities for alternate modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit, would not be subject to the improvements proposed under the proposed CCSP transportation network. With anticipated increased VMT and fewer improvements to the transportation network within the CCSP area, under Alternative 1 conditions for alternate modes of travel would be more severe.

While the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid impacts associated with the CCSP, this alternative would not further any of the CCSP's objectives or provide any of the benefits contemplated by the projects. Additionally, this alternative would result in different and greater significant impacts than the proposed CCSP. Therefore, Alternative 1 is rejected.

Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative

Description

Land Use and Zoning

The purpose of the Reduced Heights Alternative (Alternative 2) is to reduce those impacts associated with the height of development that would occur within

the commercial corridors in the CCSP area. By reducing the number of residential units and the square footage for retail, commercial and other uses in the commercial corridors, the resident, employee and visitor population within those portions of the CCSP area would drop, resulting in a greater concentration of development in the C-3 zone and potentially in residential zones in the CCSP area.

The Reduced Heights Alternative would retain the same distribution of land use and zoning designations as are described in the proposed CCSP, but would not increase allowable heights in the Central City SPD area for C-2, RMX, or OB zones. Table 6-1 provides the existing maximum allowable heights for the zones above, and maximum allowable heights for the proposed Central City SPD, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description.

**TABLE 6-1
ALLOWABLE DEVELOPMENT HEIGHTS BY ALTERNATIVE**

Zone	Existing Maximum Height (Alternative 1)	Maximum Height Under Alternative 2 (Same as Existing)	Maximum Height Under CCSP
C-2	65 feet	65 feet	85 feet
RMX	45 feet	45 feet	65 feet
OB	35 feet	35 feet	65 feet

Development under Alternative 2 would be consistent with the growth assumptions of the CCSP and the 2035 General Plan, with similar residential units and non-residential square footage, overall. As such, taller development that would be incentivized by the increased allowable heights within the C-2, RMX, and OB zones and other incentives under the CCSP, would be less concentrated along those commercial corridors. Instead, that development would be anticipated to occur in other zones throughout the plan area. Lower height limits in commercial corridors may affect future residential development and commercial uses. Fewer new residents within those zones would impact retail uses that rely on residential spending. Many developments would be required to develop above a certain number of residential units, below which some developments may become financially infeasible, and those sites would remain underutilized or undeveloped.

Infrastructure Improvements

Alternative 2 would require infrastructure improvements to serve new development but would require differing localized capacity to accommodate a similar but different distribution of growth within the CCSP area, relative to the proposed CCSP. As discussed above, Alternative 2 would result in lower density development within commercial corridors, requiring less infrastructure capacity in those areas. Under Alternative 2, vacant and under-utilized sites would still be

developed, so the amount of impervious surfaces within the CCSP area would be similar to the amount anticipated under the proposed CCSP, placing the same drainage requirements on the CSS and Basin 52. Overall, development under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed CCSP, so demand for utilities, including natural gas and electrical services within the CCSP area would be similar.

Transportation Network

The transportation improvements under Alternative 2 would be the same as would occur under the proposed CCSP. Increased allowable development height in commercial corridors (C-2, RMX, and OB zones) under the proposed CCSP would facilitate the concentration of residential and development along transit corridors, which would be anticipated to increase transit ridership and utilization of nearby bicycle network improvements. Under Alternative 2, new residential development in commercial corridors would be less dense along some of the key transit and bicycle network improvements, which would be anticipated to result in lower utilization of transit and bicycle transportation, relative to the proposed CCSP.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would be anticipated to meet CCSP objectives to facilitate arts and culture in the CCSP area (Objective 6) and cultivate high standards of urban design and best practices (Objective 8) which would celebrate the CCSP area's various cultural and geographic assets (Objective 9). Improved amenities and development streamlining, provided under Alternative 2, would encourage growth in the City inward as well as encourage integration of housing with commercial, office, and entertainment uses (Objective 1). Under Alternative 2, the City would meet the City's housing initiative (Objective 3) and streamline housing development (Objective 13), however height limitations may hinder the development of varied and unique housing options (Objective 4) and may dampen attractiveness to new, emerging, and innovative businesses (Objective 7), relative to the proposed CCSP. Under Alternative 2, expanded community amenities such as improvements to the transportation system would improve livability and quality life for CCSP area residents (Objectives 5, 10, 11, and 12). Overall, relative to the proposed CCSP, Alternative 2 would be less likely to meet all of the City's basic objectives.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Many impacts caused by Alternative 2 would either be the same as or less than the impacts of the CCSP. However, although the Reduced Heights Alternative would be anticipated to result in less development within the C-2, BO, and RMX zones, a portion of projected regional growth would be diverted into the C-3 and residential zones. As such, it is anticipated that, relative to the proposed CCSP, fewer residents would be located in close proximity to transportation

improvements under Alternative 2. Thus, fewer residents within and in the vicinity of the plan area would be anticipated to utilize bicycle, pedestrian or transit improvements, such that VMT would be higher, and there would be increased vehicle traffic within the CCSP area, and additional roadway noise. A subsequent impact would be increased queuing at CCSP area intersections, which would have increased CO concentrations as a result, and an increase in GHG emissions. In addition, with anticipated cumulative increases in vehicular traffic within the CCSP area, under Alternative 2, conditions for alternate modes of travel would be more severe.

Alternative 3: Decreased Density/Intensity Alternative

Description

The Transportation Network Option C Alternative (Alternative 3) includes all elements of the proposed CCSP including updated land use and zoning, infrastructure improvements, street light improvements, proposed hotels, and public art. However, Alternative 3 would have an alternative transportation network that includes changes to the roadway, bicycle, and transit networks included as part of the proposed CCSP. The pedestrian infrastructure investments evaluated as part of Network Option C are consistent with the investments included in the proposed CCSP. Key differences between this Alternative 3 and the proposed CCSP are summarized below.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 3 is similar to the proposed CCSP and would meet the majority of the City's objectives, with the exception of Objectives 5 and 10. The City's goal of maximizing livability and quality of life through expanded community amenities would be less satisfied by Alternative 3, as transit investments would be fewer and traffic conditions would be subject to greater congestion. Furthermore, the lesser investment in transit facilities would fail to meet the City's objective of creating a transit-first mobility network.

Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

While Alternative 3, Transportation Network Option C Alternative, would avoid or lessen some impacts associated with the CCSP, additional improvements to the transportation system would increase delay and queueing within the CCSP area at intersections and freeway off-ramps. Increased delay at CCSP area intersections would be anticipated to generate higher concentrations of CO and TACs relative to the anticipated performance of the same variables under the proposed CCSP. Increased queueing and congestion would be more likely to interrupt the performance of emergency response and emergency evacuation plans. Under Alternative 3, higher levels of congestion would contribute to increases in ambient exterior and interior noise and railway noise levels.

Under Alternative 3, there would be fewer improvements to transit facilities, including fewer lanes converted to transit-only lanes, within the CCSP area. In combination with increased delay and queueing under Alternative 3, impacts to transit facilities would be more severe.

F. Statement of Overriding Considerations:

Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15092, the City Council finds that in approving the proposed plan it has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant and potentially significant effects of the plan on the environment where feasible. The City Council further finds that it has balanced the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the plan against the remaining unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the plan and has determined that those benefits outweigh the unavoidable environmental risks and that those risks are acceptable. The City Council makes this statement of overriding considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines in support of approval of the plan.

The City of Sacramento has considered the information contained in and related to the Final EIR (the Draft EIR, Comments and Responses to those documents, text changes and other revisions to the EIR, and all other public comments, responses to comments, accompanying technical memoranda and staff reports, and findings included in the public record for the plan). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15092, the City Council finds that in approving the Central City Specific Plan, it has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant and potentially significant effects of the plan on the environment where feasible as shown in the findings. The City Council further finds that it has balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the plan against the remaining unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the plan and has determined that those benefits outweigh the unavoidable risks and that those risks are acceptable. The City Council makes this statement of overriding considerations in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 in support of approval of the plan. Specifically, in the City Council's judgment, the each of the benefits of the plan as proposed separately and independently outweigh all of the unmitigated adverse impacts and the proposed plan should be approved.

The overall goal of the proposed plan is to facilitate and incentivize residential and non-residential growth within the CCSP area. Based on the objectives identified in the Final EIR and administrative record, and through extensive public participation, the City Council has determined that the proposed plan should be approved, and any remaining significant environmental impacts attributable to the proposed plan are outweighed by the following specific environmental economic, fiscal, social, housing and other overriding considerations. Each benefit set forth below is supported by substantial evidence in the record and constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the proposed plan, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact.

The considerations that have been taken into account by the City Council in making this decision are identified below.

Land Use. The CCSP is designed to facilitate future development within the City of Sacramento's central core and serve as a bridge between 2035 General Plan and the Central City Community Plan (CCCP), customizing the planning process and land use regulations to the unique characteristics of the CCSP area. Under the proposed CCSP, the CCSP area would retain the existing land use and zoning designations as described in the 2035 General Plan. However, the proposed CCSP would include modifications to allowable maximum heights, maximum densities, and other uses within certain portions of the CCSP area, particularly along corridors. A new SPD would be created for the CCSP area in order to facilitate housing and non-residential growth. Key land use-related benefits include the following:

- The CCSP would support and further existing General Plan policies by focusing development on infill areas by encouraging the development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the existing urban fabric.
- Due to the multiple, diverse neighborhoods within the CCSP area, the CCSP provides direction to strengthen and preserve individual neighborhood identities and directs new development in the CCSP area to be in context with the surrounding area and sensitive to surrounding uses.
- The CCSP provides expanded opportunities for access to multi-modal transportation options by enhancing the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks throughout the CCSP area, linking existing neighborhoods within the CCSP area.
- The CCSP provides policies to encourage development of neighborhood amenities such as grocery stores, neighborhood-serving retail, parks and open space, and enhancement of the public realm.
- The CCSP would create opportunities for mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented urban infill development, including residential, recreation, retail, restaurant, hotel, office, open space, and other related uses in close proximity to a wide array of modes of transportation consistent with 2035 General Plan goal LU 2.1; policies LU 2.1.3 and LU 2.1.6; goal LU 2.5; policy LU 2.5.1; goal LU 2.6; policies LU 2.6.1 and LU 2.6.2; goal LU 4.1, policies LU 4.1.1, LU 4.1.2, LU 4.1.3, LU 4.1.4, LU 4.1.6, LU 4.4.6; goal LU 5.1; policies LU 5.1.2, and 5.1.3; goal LU 5.5; policy LU 5.5.1; goal LU 5.6; policies LU 5.6.2 and LU 5.6.3; goal LU 8.1; policy LU 8.1.1, LU 8.1.2, and LU 8.1.13; goal LU 8.2; policies LU 8.2.1 and 8.2.5; goal LU 9.1; policies LU 9.1.1, LU 9.1.2, and LU 9.1.3.

Housing. The plan will add approximately 13,400 housing units to the City's housing stock, focusing residential development in the Central City near jobs and transit corridors. Development anticipated under the proposed DSP would be consistent with the growth projections anticipated in the City's 2035 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan's buildout assumptions and population projections, as well as the transportation assumptions, are based largely on information provided by the SACOG for the MTP/SCS. Key housing-related benefits include the following:

- Encouragement of market-rate, high-rise and mid-rise housing in the heart of the Central City, where little market rate housing currently exists, consistent with 2035 General Plan goal LU 2.4 and policy LU 2.4.5.
- Encouragement of housing as part of mixed-use development projects, consistent with 2035 General Plan goal LU 2.1; policy LU 2.1.6; goal LU 2.6; policy LU 2.6.2; goal LU 4.1; policy LU 4.1.1; goal LU 4.4; goal LU 5.1; policies LU 5.1.1, LU 5.1.2, LU 5.1.4, and LU 5.1.5; policy LU 5.6.3; policy M 1.3.1; and Central City Community Plan policies CC.H 1.1 and CC.SPD 1.1.
- Addition of approximately 13,400 units to the housing inventory, advancing the City's ability to achieve its Downtown Housing Initiative, which is intended to facilitate development of at least 10,000 new places to live in Downtown Sacramento over the next ten years and meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation established by SACOG and reflected in the 2013-2021 Housing Element, which requires 24,101 new units, including 3,200 above moderate income, multi-family units (see 2013-2021 Housing Element, Table H9-1).

Sustainable Development. The plan is consistent with the SACOG MTP/SCS by locating housing and jobs in close proximity to transit systems, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions and lowering vehicle miles traveled, and in turn, will decrease consumption of natural resources, particularly fossil fuels. The project will create a walkable, bikeable transit-friendly community.

Development in the CCSP area would implement Title 24 (California Energy Efficiency Standards) measures that are in effect at the time of building permit issuance. The result would be lower energy consumption and higher energy efficiency. Where feasible, individual projects may employ additional energy conservation measures. This would include implementing energy conservation measures in design and construction. The proposed plan will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by creating an urban area that encourages the use of alternative modes of transportation. The project will create a walkable, bikeable transit-friendly community. This will reduce vehicle miles traveled, and in turn, will decrease consumption of natural resources, particularly fossil fuels.

Transportation. The plan will consciously implement roadways and facilities to accommodate multi-modal transportation and circulation.

- Bicycle network improvements include the provision of Class I bike paths for the exclusive use of bicyclists and pedestrians; Class II bike lanes on streets that provide delineated (i.e., striped) separation from adjacent travel lanes or parking lanes; buffered bike lanes which are enhancements to Class II bike lanes that provide buffer space to separate the bike lane from adjacent travel lanes and/or parking lanes; additional Class III bike routes on roadways shared between bicyclists and motorized vehicles; and Class IV separated bikeways (also known as protected bikeways or cycle tracks) on three streets in the Central City.
- Pedestrian network improvements include the addition of pedestrian-scale street lighting and streetscape projects such as adding street furniture, widening sidewalks, improving landscaping, and new/improved crosswalks, which create a more comfortable and safe pedestrian atmosphere. The addition of connector streets and construction of gap projects will enhance the pedestrian experience and connect the pedestrian fabric with areas within and just outside of the CCSP area, creating a more comprehensive and complete pedestrian network. The provision of activity center enhancement projects will expand existing pedestrian facilities adjacent to major activity centers in the Central City.
- The transit network would be enhanced by lane conversion projects that reduce the number of travel lanes on select one-way streets from three lanes to two lanes to provide dedicated transit lanes where the number of transit vehicles is projected to be high during the peak hour. Dedicated transit lanes would be implemented when transit volumes reach an established threshold.

Economic Development. The plan will provide opportunities to generate thousands of new annual construction jobs and long-term stable jobs through the development of non-residential development. Development of the non-residential uses in the CCSP area would create an estimated 22,750 jobs in a variety of employment sectors including medical office, retail/commercial, office, government, and services such as restaurants. encouraging participation by small and local business enterprises through a comprehensive employment and contracting policy. Key benefits of the project's economic development plan include the following:

- Buildout of the CCSP would be consistent with the smart growth principals identified in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG) Blueprint Preferred Scenario. The project promotes the City's goal to develop the downtown area as the urban core of the City. The SACOG Blueprint calls for capturing a greater amount of regional employment, retail, and housing within, or contiguous to the existing urban footprint, to

reduce urban sprawl and protect open space and agricultural land within the greater Sacramento region. The plan meets this objective by providing compact development that maximizes existing land while encouraging mixed land uses within and in close proximity to the downtown urban center.

- Buildout of the CCSP would be consistent with the Central City Community Plan urban development goal of revitalizing the Central City as a viable living, working, shopping and cultural environment. The plan proposes to develop higher density development in close proximity to the existing downtown Central Business District. This will capture a greater amount of regional employment, retail and housing within the existing urban footprint, thereby reducing urban sprawl while protecting open space and agricultural land within the greater Sacramento region. The plan adds residential, office and retail uses within the urban core of the City. This strengthens the City's downtown urban area while establishing a dynamic community, in which the uses strengthen each other and provide a full range of day and night activities.
- The CCSP will provide significant revenue to the City. The City will receive revenue from the Property Tax in lieu of Vehicle License Fee, sales taxes generated by the commercial portions of the plan, and utility taxes. The plan will also generate revenues for the City through payment of building fees and development impact fees, as well as transient occupancy taxes from hotel developments.
- The plan will provide significant employment for the City and the region. Full buildout of the plan will be anticipated to yield approximately 13,400 jobs. The plan is also expected to create a number of secondary jobs, as implementation of the plan would require construction jobs for the development of the buildings and associated site improvements. Such jobs will provide income and work experience for City residents and other workers and their families.
- Development of the projects would increase economic and employment activity in the Central Business District of Sacramento. The operation of the retail stores, offices, restaurants, hotels, and food and beverage service will generate revenue. The creation of temporary construction jobs and permanent office and retail jobs will also financially benefit the City, as it will increase sales tax revenue from the purchase of goods by CCSP area residents and employees.

Social Considerations. The plan will seek to balance a dynamic 24-hour mixed-use urban core, while providing a range of complementary uses – including office, retail, hotel, and open space – and a mixture of housing types, including affordable housing.

- The plan would enhance and expand pedestrian and green space connections to enhance the urban experience of the Central City, while providing opportunities for social interaction and civic activity. Public art installations in key locations would create or enhance civic gathering spaces, resulting in a strengthened civic and public realm.

Having considered the benefits outlined above, the City Council finds that each and every one of the benefits of approving the plan outweigh and override the unavoidable adverse environmental effects associated with the plan, and therefore, the plan's unavoidable adverse environmental effects are acceptable.

CHAPTER 4

Mitigation Monitoring Plan

4.1 Introduction

Public Resources Code section 21081.6 and section 15097 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require public agencies to establish monitoring or reporting programs for projects approved by a public agency whenever approval involves the adoption of either a mitigated negative declaration or specified environmental findings related to environmental impact reports.

The following is the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) for the Central City Specific Plan. The intent of the MMP is to track and successfully implement the mitigation measures identified within the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for this project.

4.2 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures are taken from the Sacramento Central City Specific Plan Draft EIR and are assigned the same number as in the Draft EIR. The MMP describes the actions that must take place to implement each mitigation measure, the timing of those actions, and the entities responsible for implementing and monitoring the actions.

4.3 MMP Components

The components of the attached table, which contains applicable mitigation measures, are addressed briefly, below.

Impact: This column summarizes the impact stated in the Draft EIR.

Mitigation Measure: All mitigation measures identified in the Sacramento Central City Specific Plan Draft EIR will be presented, as revised in the Final EIR, and numbered accordingly.

Action(s): For every mitigation measure, one or more actions are described. The actions delineate the means by which the mitigation measures will be implemented, and, in some instances, the criteria for determining whether a measure has been successfully implemented. Where mitigation measures are particularly detailed, the action may refer back to the measure.

Implementing Party: This item identifies the entity that will undertake the required action.

Timing: Implementation of the action must occur prior to or during some part of project approval, project design or construction or on an ongoing basis. The timing for each measure is identified.

Monitoring Party: The City of Sacramento is primarily responsible for ensuring that mitigation measures are successfully implemented. Within the City, a number of departments and divisions would have responsibility for monitoring some aspect of the overall project. Other agencies, such as the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, may also be responsible for monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures. As a result, more than one monitoring party may be identified.

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
4.2 Air Quality					
4.2-2: Construction of development under the proposed CCSP could result in short-term emissions of NOx, PM10 and PM2.5.	4.2-2(a) <i>For any development project within the CCSP area that would involve excavation, grading, or site preparation that would expose soil, the applicant shall comply with all applicable Rules of the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and shall include the required SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans.</i>	Comply with all applicable Rules of the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and include the required SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permit	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
	4.2-2(b) <i>Prior to the issuance of a demolition or building permit for major development projects in the CCSP area, each project shall be screened for construction emissions based on the then-current screening criteria established by the SMAQMD. If the project emissions fall within the limit of the screening criteria no further action is required.</i> <i>If the project exceeds the screening criteria the applicant shall model emissions for the project. If the emissions fall below the thresholds of significance for construction air emissions no further action is required.</i> <i>If the air emissions model reflects emissions above the thresholds for construction emissions, the applicant shall mitigate such emissions consistent with applicable rules and procedures of the SMAQMD and City of Sacramento. This includes the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Provide a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the proposed project to the City and the SMAQMD. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The construction contractor shall provide the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. This information shall be submitted at least four business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the proposed CCSP, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs.</i><i>Provide a plan in conjunction with the equipment inventory, approved by the SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.</i><i>Emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the project site shall not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.</i>	Include construction equipment specifications listed in Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(b) on Grading and Construction Plans.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of demolition permit or grading permit	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>If at the time of granting of each building permit, the SMAQMD has adopted a regulation applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation may completely or partially replace this mitigation. Consultation with the SMAQMD prior to construction will be necessary to make this determination.</i> <p><i>The applicant shall include the following SMAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Practices on all grading or improvement plans:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil.</i><i>Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.</i><i>Install wind breaks (e.g., plant trees, solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas.</i><i>Plant vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.</i><i>Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.</i><i>Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust and road dust carryout onto public roads.</i><i>Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the District shall also be visible to ensure compliance.</i> <p><i>The applicant shall estimate and quantify the construction emissions of NOx. The applicant shall pay into the SMAQMD's construction mitigation fund to offset construction-generated emissions of NOx that exceed SMAQMD's daily emission threshold of 85 ppd. The applicants shall keep track of actual equipment use and their NOx emissions so that mitigation fees can be adjusted accordingly for payment to the SMAQMD.</i></p>				
4.2-5: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in short-term and long-term exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants.	<p>4.2-5</p> <p><i>The City shall require implementation of the following mitigation measures as part of approval of any residences in the CCSP area within 500 feet of Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Locate sensitive receptors as far as possible from Business 80, Highway 50 or I-5.</i><i>Provide vegetative barriers between the source and receptors. Guidance from the US EPA's July 2016 Recommendations for Constructing Roadside Vegetation Barriers to Improve Near-Road Air Quality or Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Landscaping Guidance for Improving Air Quality near Roadways may be incorporated.</i>	Implement the criteria described in Mitigation Measure 4.2-5.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of a building permit	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
4.2-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in short-term (construction) emissions.	<p>4.2-7</p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) and (b).</i></p>	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-2(a) through 4.2-2(b).	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-2(a) through 4.2-2(b).	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-2(a) through 4.2-2(b).	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-2(a) through 4.2-2(b).
4.2-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could contribute to cumulative increases in short- and long-term exposures to Toxic Air Contaminants.	<p>4.2-10</p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-5.</i></p>	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-5	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-5	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-5	See Mitigation Measures 4.2-5

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
4.3 Biological Resources					
4.3-2: Development under the proposed CCSP could result in the loss of potential nesting habitat for special-status bird species and other sensitive and/or protected bird species.	4.3-2(a) <i>For projects proposed to be constructed in the CCSP area that have trees onsite or trees immediately adjacent to the project site (including within a planter strip), the applicant shall conduct a nesting bird survey to determine whether there are nesting special-status birds present. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to and within 14 days of construction activities. If nesting birds are present during the survey, then the applicant shall notify the City's Planning Director and proceed as follows:</i>	Conduct nesting surveys prior to tree removal.	Project applicant	Between February 1 and August 31, conduct surveys no more than 48-hours before tree removal	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
	1) <i>applicant shall conduct any tree removal activities required for project construction outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31) where feasible.</i>	Conduct any tree removal and construction activities according to the protocol described in Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a).			
	2) <i>trees slated for removal during the nesting season shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist no more than 48-hours before removal to ensure that no nesting birds are occupying the tree.</i>	Include tree removal timing and/or tree protection requirements on Grading and Construction Plans			
	3) <i>ending on conditions specific to each nest, and the relative location and rate of construction activities, it may be feasible for construction to occur as planned without impacting the breeding season. In this case (to be determined on an individual basis), the nest(s) shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during excavation and other outdoor construction that involves the use of heavy equipment. If, in the professional opinion of the monitor, the construction activities associated with that part of construction activities would impact the nest, the monitor shall immediately inform the construction manager and the applicant shall notify the City's Planning Director. The construction manager shall stop construction activities that have the potential to adversely affect the nest until the nest is no longer active. Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by a qualified biologist. If construction begins outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), then the applicant is permitted to continue construction activities through the breeding season.</i>				
	4) <i>applicant shall maintain a 100-ft buffer around each active purple martin nest. No construction activities are permitted within this buffer.</i>	Establish 100-buffer around active raptor nests.	Project applicant	Establish buffer no more than 48-hours before tree removal; leave buffer in place through construction of each applicable development project	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
	5) <i>other migratory birds, a no-work buffer zone shall be established around the active nest in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The no-work buffer may vary depending on species and site-specific conditions as determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.</i>	Monitor nesting activity within the 100-foot buffer	Project applicant	Monitor active nests through construction of each applicable development project	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
	4.3-2(b) <i>For projects proposed to be constructed in the CCSP area that would include the use of off-road vehicles during project construction, the applicant shall conduct a survey for Swainson's hawk nests, the survey shall be of all trees within 500 feet of the project site which has a 24-inch minimum diameter at breast height. The survey distance may be decreased based on type of construction and whether heavy construction equipment would be used. The applicant may ask the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for a reduced survey distance and/or reduced buffer area. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee's Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (2000). If active Swainson's hawk nests or other raptors' nests are found during the survey performed under Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a), construction activities shall not be permitted on those portions of the project site within 500 feet of the active nest during the Swainson's hawk breeding season (March 1 – September 15).</i>	Determine presence/absence of Swainson's Hawk within identified geography.	Project applicant	Prior to site plan and design review for individual projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	4.3-2(c) <i>For projects proposed within suitable habitat for burrowing owl (in particular for projects proposed in annual grassland habitat occurring in the northeast part of the CCSP area as shown in Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR, and areas adjacent to Sutter's Landing Park that have not been developed), the applicant shall conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls in accordance with guidance from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.</i>	Determine presence/absence of the burrowing owl within identified geography.	Project applicant	Prior to site plan and design review for individual projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
4.3-4: Projects proposed under the CCSP could result in removal of habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	4.3-4(a) <i>For projects proposed within or adjacent to habitat for VELB (suitable habitat for the VELB occurs in close proximity to the Sacramento and American rivers in association with undeveloped valley foothill riparian habitat and at undeveloped areas of Sutter's Landing Park; see Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR), the applicant shall conduct surveys prior to construction for the presence of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its elderberry host plant by a qualified biologist in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocols. If elderberry plants with stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater are not identified, no further mitigation is required.</i>	Retain a qualified biologist who shall conduct preconstruction surveys for elderberry shrubs.	Project applicant	Prior to ground disturbance such as grading and excavation activities	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	4.3-4(b) <i>If elderberry plants with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level occur on or adjacent to and within 100 feet of ground disturbing activities (shrub's dripline is within 100 feet of construction activities or site), or are otherwise located where they may be directly or indirectly affected by the project, minimization and compensation measures, which include transplanting existing shrubs and planting replacement habitat (conservation plantings) are required (see below). Surveys are valid for a period of two years. Elderberry plants with no stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level are unlikely to be habitat for the beetle because of their small size and/or immaturity. Therefore, no minimization measures are required for removal of elderberry plants with all stems measuring 1.0 inch or less in diameter at ground level.</i>	Protect shrubs within 100 feet of construction activities; compensate for removed shrubs.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of building permit	City of Sacramento Community Development Department and USFWS
	4.3-4 (c) <i>For shrubs with stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater, the applicant shall ensure that elderberry shrubs within 100 feet of ground disturbing activities be protected and/or compensated for (if affected by construction activities) in accordance with the "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services' (USFWS) Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle and the Programmatic Formal Consultation Permitting Projects with Relatively Small Effects on the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office."</i>	Protect shrubs within 100 feet of construction activities; compensate for removed shrubs.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of building permit	City of Sacramento Community Development Department and USFWS
4.3-6: Projects developed under the proposed CCSP could result in impacts to special-status bat species.	4.3-6 <i>If a project would result in the removal of large, mature trees within the riparian areas along the Sacramento or American rivers as shown on Figure 4.3-1 of the EIR or the removal of an unsealed, open to the elements, vacant building, and construction activities commence on the project site during the breeding season of special-status bat species (May 1 to August 31), then a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether active roosts are present on site or within 100 feet of the project boundaries prior to the commencement of construction activities. Field surveys shall be conducted early in the breeding season before any construction activities begin, when bats are establishing maternity roosts but before pregnant females give birth (April through early May). If no roosting bats are found, then no further mitigation is required.</i>	Retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys and prepare a report; provide the report to the City of Sacramento Community Development Department. Provide buffer around bat maternity roosts, if applicable.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of grading permit or tree removal permit; provide buffer through completion of construction or abandonment of the roosts	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<p><i>If roosting bats are found, then disturbance of the maternity roosts shall be avoided by halting construction until the end of the breeding season. Alternatively, a qualified bat biologist may exclude the roosting bats in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, thereby allowing construction to continue after successful exclusion activities.</i></p> <p><i>If the biologist determines that bats could potentially inhabit a building planned for demolition or alteration, and a nighttime survey is necessary, then the biologist may return for an emergence survey.</i></p>				
4.3-8: Projects developed pursuant to the CCSP could result in net reduction of sensitive habitats including protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands.	<p>4.3-8(a)</p> <p><i>For projects proposed in areas that contain aquatic habitat which may support wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands (i.e., riparian or riverine areas associated with the Sacramento and American rivers as shown on Figure 4.3-1 in the EIR), the applicant shall conduct a formal aquatic resources delineation within those project sites. The aquatic resources delineation shall be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for verification. If jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands are not present, no further action is required.</i></p>	Prepare a wetland and riparian mitigation plan.	Project applicant	Concurrent with 404 permit process and Streambed Alteration Agreement process	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, USACE, and CDFW
	<p>4.3-8 (b)</p> <p><i>If jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands are present, the applicant shall avoid them if feasible. The applicant shall minimize disturbances and construction footprints near avoided wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands to the extent feasible.</i></p>	Install protective fencing.	Project applicant	Prior to and during construction on individual applicable development sites	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, USACE, and CDFW
	<p>4.3-8 (c)</p> <p><i>If avoidance of wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands are not feasible, then the applicant shall demonstrate that there is no net loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S., riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands through compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404 requirements.</i></p>	Implement erosion control measures including adding measures to construction plans.	Project applicant	During construction activities in-water and adjacent to the Sacramento River	City of Sacramento Community Development Department, USACE, and CDFW
4.3-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP could result in removal of protected street trees and conflict with local policies protecting trees.	<p>4.3-10</p> <p><i>For any project within the CCSP area that would remove protected trees as defined by City Code 12.56, the applicant shall submit a tree removal permit application for the removal of protected trees and comply with all conditions of any issued permit.</i></p>	Conduct tree removal activities in accordance with City tree protection ordinance.	Project applicant	During site plan and design review and in compliance with tree protection ordinance requirements	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.3-11: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative harm to, or loss of nesting habitat, for nesting habitat for special-status bird species and other sensitive and/or protected bird species.	<p>4.3-11</p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).</i></p>	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).
4.3-13: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.	<p>4.3-13</p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).</i></p>	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-2(a), 4.3-2(b), and 4.3-2(c).
4.3-14: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of habitat, or impacts to bat species.	<p>4.3-14</p> <p><i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-6</i></p>	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-6.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-6	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-6	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-6

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
4.3-15: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of sensitive habitats including protected wetland habitat as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, riparian vegetation, and state jurisdictional waters/wetlands.	4.3-15 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-8(a), 4.3-8(b), and 4.3-8(c).
4.3-16: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to the cumulative loss of locally protected trees.	4.3-16 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-8</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8
4.4 Cultural Resources					
4.4-1: New construction in the proposed CCSP area could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including human remains.	4.4-1(a) Unanticipated Discovery Protocol for Archaeological Resources and Human Remains <i>If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered during any stage of construction for any project in the CCSP area, all ground disturbing activities shall halt within the project property up to 100 feet from the location of the discovery and the City shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials include, for example, obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Any tribal cultural resources discovered during project work shall be immediately disclosed to the City and treated in consultation with the Native American monitor on site, if applicable, or with Native American representatives, with the goal of preserving in place with proper treatment. Historic-period materials may include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. A qualified archaeologist, defined as one meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology, shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery. If the City determines that an archaeological resource qualifies as a historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or tribal cultural resource (as defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines) and that the project has potential to damage or destroy the resource, the following shall be implemented:</i> 1) <i>the resource has an association with Native Americans, the City shall consult with appropriate Native American Tribal Representatives and a qualified archaeologist to determine the appropriate mitigation. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means: (1) modifying the construction plan to avoid the resource; (2) incorporating the resource within open space; (3) capping and covering the resource before building appropriate facilities on the resource site; or (4) deeding resource site into a permanent conservation easement. Consultation between the City, Native American Tribal Representatives, and a qualified archaeologist may result in alternative means of preservation for archaeological resources and/or tribal cultural resources associated with Native Americans.</i>	Retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare and implement an Archaeological Testing Plan (ATP).	Project applicant	Prior to ground disturbance such as grading and excavation activities for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<p>2) <i>the resource does not have an association with Native Americans, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), mitigation shall be accomplished through either preservation in place or, if preservation in place is not feasible, data recovery through excavation. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means: (1) modifying the construction plan to avoid the resource; (2) incorporating the resource within open space; (3) capping and covering the resource before building appropriate facilities on the resource site; or (4) deeding resource site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan to recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to any excavation at the resource site. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the Project. The treatment plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.</i></p>	Prepare an Archaeological Mitigation Plan, if necessary.	Project applicant	Prior to ground disturbance such as grading and excavation activities for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>3) <i>the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project implementation, project construction activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease until the Sacramento County Coroner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. The City shall comply with requirements identified by the NAHC for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[d]).</i></p>	Cease work and notify the County Coroner. Follow protocol for further notification including to the NAHC, if applicable. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission to identify the Most Likely Descendant, if applicable.	Project applicant	During ground-disturbing activities for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>4.4-1(b) Identification of Sensitive Areas</p> <p><i>The City, based on input from Native American consultation, shall prepare a map of the CCSP area identifying previously recorded archaeological resources and potential locations of tribal cultural resources—these areas to be collectively known as “sensitive areas”—for use by the City, applicant, archaeologist and Native American monitor. The map shall be subject to California law regarding confidentiality of such materials.</i></p>	Retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare and implement an Archaeological Monitoring Plan for the area within the footprint of the northern levee embankment.	Project applicant	Prepare plan prior to ground-disturbing activities (grading or excavation) that are anticipated to extend below the level of North B Street; implement plan during ground-disturbing activities	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>4.4-1(c) Worker Training and Archaeological Monitoring of Project Ground-Disturbing Activities in Sensitive Areas</p> <p><i>The provisions of this mitigation measure shall not be required for projects in sensitive areas that consist of: 1) replacement of existing facilities (road signs, sidewalks, pipes, etc.) where ground disturbance would occur principally in previously disturbed sediment, or 2) minor levels of ground disturbance (e.g., to no more than 18 inches below surface). For all other projects in the CCSP area that are within sensitive areas:</i></p> <p>1. <i>Construction worker cultural resources awareness training shall be conducted for construction personnel involved with excavation activities where ground disturbance would be greater than 18 inches below the ground surface. The training shall consist of a preconstruction training session conducted by or under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist, defined as one meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology, and shall be held for all construction personnel and staff involved with excavation activities. The training may be delivered to applicable construction personnel via an electronic format (DVD or video file, for example).</i></p>	Cease work if a discovery is made. Conduct field investigation. Recover data and record resources on appropriate DPR forms, as appropriate. If find is Native American in origin, follow actions outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a).	Project applicant	During ground-disturbing activities for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<i>Training content will cover procedures to be followed and appropriate conduct to be adhered to if archaeological materials, including tribal cultural resources, are encountered during the project work. Training will include:</i> <i>a) Purpose of archaeological monitoring;</i> <i>b) Identifying archaeological resources; and</i> <i>c) Maintaining proper discovery protocols during construction.</i>				
	2. <i>Excavation work within the areas identified as sensitive areas shall be undertaken in a manner that is responsive to the potential for discovery of resources. The applicant, archaeologist, and tribal monitor shall coordinate in implementing construction techniques. In the event of dispute, the City's Director of Community Development shall be consulted and shall determine the appropriate procedures at the site.</i>				
	3. <i>An archaeologist meeting, or supervised by an archaeologist meeting, the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archeology, shall monitor all project ground-disturbing activities within the sensitive areas agreed upon by the City and Native American Tribal Representatives. Information regarding the location of ground disturbing activities and any resource finds shall be kept on file at the City. Such monitoring and reporting shall be conducted at the applicant's expense.</i>				
	4. <i>A Native American monitor shall be employed at the applicant's expense to conduct monitoring of project construction activities for sensitive areas. The conduct and work of any Native American monitor shall be consistent with the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Guidelines for Native American Monitors/Consultants.</i>				
	5. <i>Potential tribal cultural resources discovered during project work shall be treated in consultation with the Native American monitor on site.</i>				
	6. <i>If discovery is made of items of potential archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources, the procedures set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) shall be followed.</i>				
4.4-2: New construction in the CCSP area could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.	4.4-2(a) <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).</i>	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).
4.4-4: New construction in the proposed CCSP area, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to the cumulative loss or alteration of archaeological resources, including human remains.	4.4-4 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).</i>	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).	See Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(a) through (c).
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
4.8-1: Development pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose people to contaminated soil during construction activities.	4.8-1 <i>If a development site is listed in the Phase I ESA Overview Study as being of moderate or high potential to have a Recognized Environmental Condition (REC), the applicant shall conduct a site specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment during the entitlement process in general accordance with the current version of ASTM 1527 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process prior to construction and shall comply with the recommendations in the report. Recommendations may include guidance on mitigating hazards from encountering contaminated groundwater, including measures related to disturbance of existing treatment systems, drilling, groundwater extraction, or vapor intrusion.</i>	Implement a site specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment during the entitlement process prior to construction.	Project applicant	During the entitlement process, prior to ground-disturbing activities (grading or excavation)	City of Sacramento Community Development Department.

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<i>This requirement does not apply to projects in which excavation would extend no deeper than 18 inches, including projects that are limited to installation of a fence, deck, single-family residence, garage or addition to an existing residence (e.g., room addition), shallow landscaping with or without irrigation lines, or other minor site improvements, or replacement of existing facilities (road signs, sidewalks, pipes, etc.) where ground disturbance would occur principally in previously disturbed sediment.</i>				
4.8-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts by exposing people to contaminated soil during construction activities.	4.8-7 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.8-1.
4.10 Noise and Vibration					
4.10-1: Construction of development allowed under the proposed CCSP could generate noise that would conflict with City standards or result in substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.	4.10-1 <i>For all projects in the CCSP area that require a building permit, the City shall require that the contractor implement the following measures during all phases of construction:</i> a) <i>All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall have manufacturer-installed mufflers.</i>	Implement the requirement for manufacturer-installed mufflers to be on all to all heavy equipment or stationary noise sources.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permit; include measures on construction drawings	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	b) <i>Auger displacement shall be used for installation of foundation piles, if feasible. If impact pile driving is required, sonic pile drivers shall be used, unless engineering studies are submitted to the City that show this is not feasible, based on geotechnical considerations.</i>	Implement auger displacement or sonic pile driver requirements.	Project applicant	Include measures on construction drawings	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.10-2: Operations of development allowed under the proposed CCSP could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient exterior noise levels.	4.10-2 <i>For development of new commercial or mixed-use buildings within the CCSP area, the applicant shall demonstrate that noise levels from HVAC and/or loading docks would not exceed the stationary noise standards established in the City's Code. To demonstrate that a proposed development will meet the City's stationary noise standards, the developer must implement the following measures:</i>	Submit engineering and acoustical specification for project mechanical HVAC equipment and the proposed locations of onsite loading docks.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of building permits	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	a) <i>Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit engineering and acoustical specification for project mechanical HVAC equipment and the proposed locations of onsite loading docks to the Planning Director demonstrating that the HVAC equipment and loading dock design (types, location, enclosure, specification) will control noise from the equipment to at least 10 dB below existing ambient levels at nearby residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.</i>	Enclose or shield noise-generating equipment.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permit; include measures on construction drawings	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	b) <i>Noise-generating stationary equipment associated with proposed commercial and/or office uses, including portable generators, compressors, and compactors shall be enclosed or acoustically shielded to reduce noise-related impacts to noise-sensitive residential uses.</i>				
4.10-4: Construction of buildings pursuant to the proposed CCSP could expose existing and/or planned buildings, and persons within, to vibration that could disturb people or damage buildings.	4.10-4(a) <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<p>4.10-4(b)</p> <p><i>For all projects in the CCSP area that require the use of graders or impact pile drivers:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or building permit, the applicant shall develop and submit a Vibration Reduction Plan to the City Chief Building Official for approval. The Plan shall include measures that will reduce vibration at surrounding buildings to less than 80 VdB and 83 VdB where people sleep and work, respectively, and less than 0.25 PPV for historic buildings. Measures and controls shall be identified based on project-specific final design plans, and may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following:</i></p>	Prepare and submit a Vibration Reduction Plan. Implement vibration avoidance, minimization, and monitoring requirements within the Vibration Reduction Plan.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of a building permit for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>1) <i>Inclusion of buffers and selection of equipment to minimize vibration impacts during construction at nearby receptors in order to meet the specified standards.</i></p>	Limit vibration during construction.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of a building permit for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>2) <i>Implementation of a vibration, crack, and line and grade monitoring program at existing Nationally registered, State listed, and locally recognized historic buildings located within 47 feet of construction activities. The following elements shall be included in this program:</i></p>				
	<p><i>i. Prior to start of construction:</i></p>				
	<p>1. <i>The applicant or construction contractor shall install crack gauges on proximate historic structures.</i></p>	Prepare crack monitoring plan for existing historic buildings located within 47 feet of construction activities. Project applicant shall provide City with regular reporting.	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of a building permit for individual applicable development projects	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p><i>ii. During building construction:</i></p>				
	<p>1. <i>The construction contractor shall regularly inspect and photograph crack gauges, maintaining records of these inspections to be included in post-construction reporting. Gauges shall be inspected every two weeks, or more frequently during periods of active project actions in close proximity to crack gauges.</i></p>	Monitor crack gauges during construction.	Project applicant	During construction activities within 47 feet of a historic building	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>2. <i>The construction contractor shall collect vibration data from receptors and report vibration levels to the City Chief Building Official on a monthly basis. The reports shall include annotations regarding project activities as necessary to explain changes in vibration levels, along with proposed corrective actions to avoid vibration levels approaching or exceeding the established threshold.</i></p>	Collect and report vibration data to City Chief Building Official.	Project applicant	During construction activities within 47 feet of a historic building	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	<p>3. <i>If vibration levels exceed the threshold and monitoring or inspection indicates that the project is damaging the historic structure, additional protection or stabilization shall be implemented. If necessary and with approval by the City Chief Building Official, the construction contractor shall install temporary shoring or stabilization to help avoid permanent impacts. Stabilization may involve structural reinforcement or corrections for deterioration that would minimize or avoid potential structural failures or avoid accelerating damage to the historic structure. Stabilization shall be conducted following the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. This treatment shall ensure retention of the historical resource's character-defining features. Stabilization may temporarily impair the historic integrity of the building's design, material, or setting, and as such, the stabilization must be conducted in a manner that will not permanently impair a building's ability to convey its significance. Measures to shore or stabilize the building shall be installed in a manner that avoids damage to the historic integrity of the building, including integrity of material.</i></p>	Provide additional protection or stabilization of historic structures, as needed.	Project applicant	During construction activities within 47 feet of a historic building	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
	<i>iii. Post-construction</i>				
	1. <i>At the conclusion of vibration generating construction activities, the applicant shall submit a crack and vibration monitoring report to the City Chief Building Official. The report shall include: a narrative summary of the monitoring activities and their findings; photographs illustrating the post-construction state of cracks and material conditions that were presented in the pre-construction assessment report; annotated analysis of vibration data related to project activities; a summary of measures undertaken to avoid vibration impacts; a post-construction line and grade survey; and photographs of other relevant conditions showing the impact, or lack of impact, of project activities. The photographs shall be of sufficient detail to illustrate damage, if any, caused by the project and/or show how the project did not cause physical damage to the historic and non-historic buildings.</i>	Prepare crack monitoring and vibration monitoring final report to the City. Include post-construction photographs of cracks, as applicable.	Project applicant	Upon completion of construction activities within 47 feet of a historic building	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
	2. <i>The applicant shall be responsible for repairs from damage to historic and non-historic buildings if damage is caused by vibration or movement during the demolition and/or construction activities. Repairs may be necessary to address, for example, cracks that expanded as a result of the project, physical damage visible in post-construction assessment, or holes or connection points that were needed for shoring or stabilization. Repairs shall be limited to project impacts and do not apply to general rehabilitation or restoration activities of the buildings. If necessary for historic structures, repairs shall be conducted in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. The applicant shall provide a work plan for the repairs and a completion report to ensure compliance with the SOI Standards to the City Chief Building Official and City Preservation Director for review and comment.</i>	Make repairs to damages historic and non-historic buildings caused by project construction, as applicable.	Project applicant	Upon completion of construction activities within 47 feet of a historic building	City of Sacramento Community Development Department
4.10-5: Implementation of the proposed CCSP would result in exposure of people to cumulative increases in construction noise levels.	4.10-5 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1.
4.10-6: Operations of development allowed under the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative increases in ambient exterior noise levels.	4.10-6 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.</i>	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-2.
4.10-8: Construction of buildings pursuant to the proposed CCSP would contribute to cumulative construction that could expose existing and/or planned buildings, and persons within, to significant vibration.	4.10-8 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-4(a) and (b).
4.11 Public Services					
4.11-8: The proposed CCSP could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities or the need for new or physically altered parks or recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for parks and recreation services.	4.11-8 <i>Projects within the CCSP area shall comply with the City's Quimby and Park Impact Fees (PIF) ordinances.</i>	Pay City in lieu park dedication fees (Quimby), or Park Impact Fees.	Project applicant	Prior to filing of final map	City of Sacramento Community Development Department

TABLE 4-1
SACRAMENTO CENTRAL CITY SPECIFIC PLAN, MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Action(s)	Implementing Party	Timing	Monitoring Party
4.11-9: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in the physical deterioration of existing CCSP area parks, requiring additional parks to be provided.	4.11-9 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.	See Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.	See Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.	See Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.
4.12 Transportation					
4.12-3: The proposed CCSP could worsen freeway operations.	4.12-3 Freeway Subregional Corridor Mitigation Program (SCMP). <i>Each project developed pursuant to the CCSP, and subject to mitigation measures of the CCSP EIR, that generates more than 100 vehicular AM or PM peak hour trips that are directed toward the highway system shall:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Remit monetary payment to the I-5 Freeway Subregional Corridor Mitigation Program (SCMP). This remittance shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits.</i> <i>OR</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Negotiate a mutually acceptable agreement with Caltrans and the City.</i> <i>Projects in the CCSP area that would be exempt from the implementation of this measure include projects not subject to CEQA (Public Resources Code (PRC) §21080(b)), projects that are categorically exempt from CEQA or projects eligible for statutory streamlining including but not limited to qualified housing projects (PRC §§21159.21 and 21159.24), affordable low-income housing projects (PRC §21159.23), and qualifying infill developments (PRC §21094.5 and State CEQA Guidelines §15332), as well as projects that are not required to address specific or cumulative impact from cars and light-duty truck trips generated by the project on the regional transportation network (PRC §21159.28).</i>	Implement payment to the I-5 Freeway Subregional Corridor Mitigation Program (SCMP).	Project applicant	Prior to the issuance of building permits	See Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(a)(ii).
4.12-10: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, could contribute to cumulative impacts to freeway operations.	4.12-10 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-3.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.12-3	See Mitigation Measure 4.12-3	See Mitigation Measure 4.12-3	See Mitigation Measure 4.12-3
4.13 Utilities					
4.13-1: The proposed CCSP would discharge additional flows to the City's sewer and drainage systems, which could exceed existing infrastructure capacity.	4.13-1 <i>The City shall manage wastewater from the CCSP such that it shall not exceed existing CSS capacity by implementing the following methods:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) <i>Project applicants within the CCSP area shall pay the established CSS mitigation fee.</i>b) <i>For projects within the CCSP area that require localized upsizing of existing CSS infrastructure for service, applicants shall pay their fair share for improvements to upsize or upgrade the CSS infrastructure. A separate cost sharing agreement may be executed between applicants and the City for this option.</i>	<i>Pay the established CSS mitigation fee and pay share for improvements to upsize or upgrade the CSS infrastructure. A separate cost sharing agreement may be executed.</i>	City of Sacramento and Project Applicant	To be determined by the City based on citywide water demand and supply	City of Sacramento Public Works Department
4.13-3: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for wastewater and stormwater facilities.	4.13-3 <i>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.13-1.</i>	See Mitigation Measure 4.13-1	See Mitigation Measure 4.13-1	See Mitigation Measure 4.13-1	See Mitigation Measure 4.13-1
4.13-7: Implementation of the proposed CCSP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative increases in demand for water supply.	4.13-7 <i>To ensure that sufficient capacity would be available to meet cumulative demands, the City shall implement, to the extent needed in order to secure sufficient supply, one or a combination of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) <i>Maximize Water Conservation</i>b) <i>Implement New Water Diversion and/or Treatment Infrastructure</i>c) <i>Implement Additional Groundwater Pumping</i>	Implement, to the extent needed in order to secure sufficient water supply, one or a combination of the actions listed in Mitigation Measure 4.13-7.	City of Sacramento	To be determined by the City based on citywide water demand and supply	City of Sacramento Public Works Department