Office of Planning and Environmental Review Leighann Moffitt, Director



County Executive Navdeep S. Gill

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 6, Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Code of Regulations and pursuant to the Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents adopted by the County of Sacramento pursuant to Sacramento County Ordinance No. SCC-116, the Environmental Coordinator of Sacramento County, State of California, does prepare, make, declare, publish, and cause to be filed with the County Clerk of Sacramento County, State of California, this Negative Declaration re: The Project described as follows:

- 1. Control Number: PLNP2018-00054
- 2. Title and Short Description of Project: 8171 Excelsior Road Tentative Parcel Map A Tentative Parcel Map to divide an approximately 10-acre property into four two-acre lots and one two-acre remainder lot in the AR-2 zone (Agricultural Residential – 2 Acres) in the Vineyard Community.
- 3. Assessor's Parcel Number: 123-0080-005
- 4. Location of Project: The project site is located at 8171 Excelsior Road, Sacramento, CA 95829 in the Vineyard community of unincorporated Sacramento.
- 5. Project Applicant: Real Investing, LLC
- 6. Said project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

 a. It will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
 - b. It will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
 - c. It will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
 - d. It will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- 7. As a result thereof, the preparation of an environmental impact report pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California) is not required.
- 8. The attached Initial Study has been prepared by the Sacramento County Office of Planning and Environmental Review in support of this Negative Declaration. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Office of Planning and Environmental Review at 827 Seventh Street, Room 225, Sacramento, California, 95814, or phone (916) 874-6141.

[Original Signature on File] Tim Hawkins Environmental Coordinator County of Sacramento, State of California

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT INFORMATION

CONTROL NUMBER: PLNP2018-00054

NAME: 8171 Excelsior Road Tentative Parcel Map

LOCATION: The project site is located at 8171 Excelsior Road, Sacramento, CA 95829 in the Vineyard community of unincorporated Sacramento.

Assessor's Parcel Number: 123-0080-005

OWNER: Surwinder Grewal

APPLICANT: Real Investing, LLC

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. A Tentative Parcel Map to divide an approximately 10-acre property into four twoacre lots and one two-acre remainder lot in the AR-2 zone (Agricultural Residential – 2 Acres) in the Vineyard Community (reference Plate IS-1).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in the Vineyard community of unincorporated Sacramento County, northeast of the city of Elk Grove in California's Central Valley. The project area is bordered to the north, east, and south by rural residences and pastureland. Immediately to the west is Excelsior Road and grassland. Farther west and to the north there is extensive residential development.

Improvements on-site include one single-family residence (3,419 square feet) and the associated driveway. The home is located on the western portion of the parcel. Valley grassland is the predominant land cover type on site and comprises 8.29 acres. The property is grazed by livestock. Two ephemeral swales run in a southerly direction across the site. The eastern portion of the parcel has eight seasonal wetland features.

Plate IS-1: Proposed Tentative Parcel Map



ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed an Initial Study Checklist (located at the end of this report). The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The topical discussions that follow are provided only when additional analysis beyond the Checklist is warranted.

PUBLIC SERVICES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project
- Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project
- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities

The subject parcel is located within the Urban Services Boundary, but outside of the Urban Policy Area. While the parcel is located within the Sacramento County Water Agency's (SCWA) service area and has access to public water supply, it does not have access to public sewer as it is located outside of the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) and Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District (Regional San) service areas.

Policy PF-13 of the Sacramento County General Plan's Public Facilities Element states:

Policy PF-13. Public sewer systems shall not extend service into agriculturalresidential areas outside the urban policy area unless the Environmental Management Department determines that there exists significant environmental or health risks created by private disposal systems serving existing development and no feasible alternatives exist to public sewer service.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

SCWA reviewed the project and confirmed the parcel is within their service area and that SCWA has an adequate water supply for the project; however, at the time of the drafting of this document, the applicant is proposing to construct private wells for each of the parcels. As currently proposed, the project would result in a minimum of three new wells. The introduction of three private, residential wells would have a negligible impact on groundwater supply.

Sacramento County Code Chapters 6.28 and 6.32 provide rules and regulations for water wells and septic systems that are designed to protect water quality. Each well must be installed in compliance with the Environmental Health Division of the County Environmental Management Department's (EMD) well permitting and inspection program.

The project does not have access to public sewer. Each individual proposed parcel will be required to have its own individual septic system. Each septic system must be installed in compliance with EMD's liquid waste permitting and inspection program requirements. EMD has permit approval authority for any new water wells and septic systems on the site.

CONCLUSION

Compliance with existing regulations will ensure that impacts are *less than significant*.

AIR QUALITY

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

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

The proposed project site is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB's frequent temperature inversions result in a relatively stable atmosphere that increases the potential for pollution. Within the SVAB, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for ensuring that emission standards are not violated. Reference Table IS-1 for state and federal air quality standards. Project related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing air quality violation (Table IS-2). Moreover, SMAQMD has established significance thresholds to determine if a proposed project's emission contribution significantly contributes to regional air quality impacts (Table IS-2).

Pollutant	Attainment with State Standards	Attainment with Federal Standards
Ozone	Non-Attainment Classification = Serious (1 hour Standard ¹)	Non-Attainment, Classification = Severe -15* (1 hour ² and 8 hour ³ Standards)
Particulate Matter 10 Micron	Non-Attainment (24 hour Standard and Annual Mean)	Attainment (24 hour standard)

		<u> </u>	A	~· ·
1 3 6 6 1 - 1 -	Air ()ustity	/ Standarde	Attainmont	Statuc
I aDIC 13-T	All Quality	i Stanuarus	ALLANNICHL	Juaius

Particulate Matter 2.5 Micron	Non-Attainment (Annual Standard)	Non-Attainment (24 hour Standard) and Unclassified/Attainment (Annual)
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment (1 hour and 8 hour Standards)	Attainment (1 hour and 8 hour Standards)
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment (1 hour Standard and Annual)	Unclassified/Attainment (1 hour and Annual)
Sulfur Dioxide ⁴	Attainment (1 hour and 24 hour Standards)	Attainment (1 hour)
Lead	Attainment (30 Day Standard)	Attainment (3-month rolling average)
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified (8 hour Standard)	No Federal Standard
Sulfates	Attainment (24 hour Standard)	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified (1 hour Standard)	No Federal Standard

1. Per Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 40921.59(c), the classification is based on 1989-1001 data, and therefore does not change.

2. Air Quality meets Federal 1-hour Ozone standard (77 FR 64036). EPA revoked this standard, but some associated requirements still apply. The SMAQMD attained the standard in 2009. SMAQMD has requested EPA recognize attainment to fulfill the requirements.

3. For both that 1997 and the 2008 Standard.

4. Cannot be classified

*Federal designations based on information from http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17/pdf/CFR-2010-title40-vol17-sec81-305.pdf

*California Area Designations based on information from <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/changes.htm#reports</u>

Source: SMAQMD. "Air Quality Standards Attainment Status". *Air Quality Data*. December 23, 2013. Web. Accessed: July 6, 2015. <u>http://www.airquality.org/aqdata/attainmentstat.shtml</u>

	ROG ¹	NO _x	CO	PM10	PM _{2.5}
	(lbs./day)	(lbs./day)	(µg/m³)	(lbs./day)	(lbs./day)
Construction (short-term)	None	85	CAAQS ²	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}
Operational (long-term)	65	65	CAAQS	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}
1. Reactive Organic Gas					

Table IS-2: SMAQMD Significance Thresholds

2. California Ambient Air Quality Standards

3*. Only applies to projects for which all feasible best available control technology (BACT) and best management practices (BMPs) have been applied. Projects that fail to apply all feasible BACT/BMPs must meet a significance threshold of 0 lbs./day.

In order to use the non-zero thresholds of significance for operational PM emissions as listed in Table IS-2, SMAQMD requires a project to employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Best Available Control Technology (BACT). It should be noted that the implementation of BACT are only required for stationary source operational emissions. BACT can be determined through consultation with SMAQMD permitting staff. Projects that fail to apply all feasible BACT/BMPs must meet a significance threshold of zero pounds per day.

The list from Chapter 4 of the SMAQMD "Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County" (December 2009, as amended, hereinafter called the SMAQMD Guide) identifies the BMPs for operational PM emissions for land use development projects. For this project only one item on the list applies:

Compliance with District rules that control operational PM and NOx emissions. Reference rules regarding wood burning devices, boilers, water heaters, generators and other PM control rules that may apply to equipment to be located at the project. Current rules can be found on the District's website: http://www.airguality.org/Businesses/Rules-Regulations

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS/SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

Short-term air quality impacts are mostly due to dust (PM10 and PM2.5) generated by construction and development activities, and emissions from equipment and vehicle engines (NOx) operated during these activities. Dust generation is dependent on soil type and soil moisture, as well as the amount of total acreage actually involved in clearing, grubbing and grading activities. Clearing and earthmoving activities comprise the major source of construction dust generation, but traffic and general disturbance of the soil also contribute to the problem. Sand, lime or other fine particulate materials may be used during construction, and stored on-site. If not stored properly, such materials could become airborne during periods of high winds. The effects of construction activities include increased dust fall and locally elevated levels of suspended

particulates. PM10 and PM2.5 are considered unhealthy because the particles are small enough to inhale and damage lung tissue, which can lead to respiratory problems.

PARTICULATE MATTER & OZONE PRECURSOR EMISSIONS

The SMAQMD Guide includes screening criteria for construction-related particulate matter. Projects that are 35 acres or less in size will generally not exceed the SMAQMD's construction PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, or NO_x thresholds of significance provided that the project does not:

- Include buildings more than 4 stories tall;
- Include demolition activities;
- Include significant trenching activities;
- Have a construction schedule that is unusually compact, fast-paced, or involves more than 2 phases (i.e., grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coatings) occurring simultaneously;
- Involve cut-and-fill operations (moving earth with haul trucks and/or flattening or terracing hills); or,
- Require import or export of soil materials that will require a considerable amount of haul truck activity

Some PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions during project construction can be reduced through compliance with institutional requirements for dust abatement and erosion control. These institutional measures include the SMAQMD "District Rule 403-Fugitive Dust" and measures in the Sacramento County Code relating to land grading and erosion control [Title 16, Chapter 16.44, Section 16.44.090(K)].

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Since the project involves minor cut-and-fill operations for the grading of access road and three building pads, the project does not meet SMAQMD screening criteria. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to assess estimated construction- related emissions for the project. The estimated construction-related emissions can be found in Table IS-3.

	ROG ¹ (lbs./day)	NO _x (lbs./day)	CO (µg/m³)	PM ₁₀ (lbs./day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs./day)
Construction emissions thresholds	None	85	CAAQS ²	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}
Project Estimates	12.23	50.27	CAAQS	20.65	12.06

Table IS-3: Estimated Construction-Related Emissions

1. Reactive Organic Gas

2. California Ambient Air Quality Standards

3*. Only applies to projects for which all feasible best available control technology (BACT) and best management practices (BMPs) have been applied. Projects that fail to apply all feasible BACT/BMPs must meet a significance threshold of 0 lbs./day.

As shown Table IS-3, the project will not exceed the PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} significance thresholds during the construction period.

CONCLUSION

Since the proposed project is significantly below the construction thresholds adopted by SMAQMD, impacts to Air Quality are considered *less than significant.*

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.
- Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
- Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality.

WATER QUALITY

CONSTRUCTION WATER QUALITY: EROSION AND GRADING

Construction on undeveloped land exposes bare soil, which can be mobilized by rain or wind and displaced into waterways or become an air pollutant. Construction equipment can also track mud and dirt onto roadways, where rains will wash the sediment into storm drains and thence into surface waters. After construction is complete, various other pollutants generated by site use can also be washed into local waterways. These pollutants include; but are not limited to: vehicle fluids, heavy metals deposited by vehicles, and pesticides or fertilizers used in landscaping.

Sacramento County has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by Regional Water Board. The Municipal Stormwater Permit requires the County to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable and to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges. The County complies with this permit in part by developing and enforcing ordinances and requirements to reduce the discharge of sediments and other pollutants in runoff from newly developing and redeveloping areas of the County.

The County has established a Stormwater Ordinance (Sacramento County Code 15.12). The Stormwater Ordinance prohibits the discharge of unauthorized nonstormwater to the County's stormwater conveyance system and local creeks. It applies to all private and public projects in the County, regardless of size or land use type. In addition, Sacramento County Code 16.44 (Land Grading and Erosion Control) requires private construction sites disturbing one or more acres or moving 350 cubic yards or more of earthen material to obtain a grading permit. To obtain a grading permit, project proponents must prepare and submit for approval an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan describing erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) that will be implemented during construction to prevent sediment from leaving the site and entering the County's storm drain system or local receiving waters. Construction projects not subject to SCC 16.44 are subject to the Stormwater Ordinance (SCC 15.12) described above.

In addition to complying with the County's ordinances and requirements, construction sites disturbing one or more acres are required to comply with the State's General Stormwater Permit for Construction Activities (CGP). CGP coverage is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board)

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml and enforced by the Regional Water Board. Coverage is obtained by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Board prior to construction and verified by receiving a WDID#. The CGP requires preparation and implementation of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that must be kept on site at all times for review by the State inspector.

Applicable projects applying for a County grading permit must show proof that a WDID # has been obtained and must submit a copy of the SWPPP. Although the County has no enforcement authority related to the CGP, the County does have the authority to ensure sediment/pollutants are not discharged and is required by its Municipal Stormwater Permit to verify that SWPPPs include the minimum components.

The project must include an effective combination of erosion, sediment and other pollution control BMPs in compliance with the County ordinances and the State's CGP.

Erosion controls should always be the *first line of defense*, to keep soil from being mobilized in wind and water. Examples include stabilized construction entrances, tackified mulch, 3-step hydroseeding, spray-on soil stabilizers and anchored blankets. Sediment controls are the *second line of defense*; they help to filter sediment out of runoff before it reaches the storm drains and local waterways. Examples include rock

bags to protect storm drain inlets, staked or weighted straw wattles/fiber rolls, and silt fences.

In addition to erosion and sediment controls, the project must have BMPs in place to keep other construction-related wastes and pollutants out of the storm drains. Such practices include, but are not limited to: filtering water from dewatering operations, providing proper washout areas for concrete trucks and stucco/paint contractors, containing wastes, managing portable toilets properly, and dry sweeping instead of washing down dirty pavement.

It is the responsibility of the project proponent to verify that the proposed BMPs for the project are appropriate for the unique site conditions, including topography, soil type and anticipated volumes of water entering and leaving the site during the construction phase. In particular, the project proponent should check for the presence of colloidal clay soils on the site. Experience has shown that these soils do not settle out with conventional sedimentation and filtration BMPs. The project proponent may wish to conduct settling column tests in addition to other soils testing on the site, to ascertain whether conventional BMPs will work for the project.

If sediment-laden or otherwise polluted runoff discharges from the construction site are found to impact the County's storm drain system and/or Waters of the State, the property owner will be subject to enforcement action and possible fines by the County and the Regional Water Board.

CONCLUSION

Project compliance with requirements outlined above, as administered by the County and the Regional Water Board will ensure that project-related erosion and pollution impacts are *less than significant*.

OPERATION: STORMWATER RUNOFF

Development and urbanization can increase pollutant loads, temperature, volume and discharge velocity of runoff over the predevelopment condition. The increased volume, increased velocity, and discharge duration of stormwater runoff from developed areas has the potential to greatly accelerate downstream erosion and impair stream habitat in natural drainage systems. Studies have demonstrated a direct correlation between the degree of imperviousness of an area and the degradation of its receiving waters. These impacts must be mitigated by requiring appropriate runoff reduction and pollution prevention controls to minimize runoff and keep runoff clean for the life of the project.

The County requires that projects include source and/or treatment control measures on selected new development and redevelopment projects. Source control BMPs are intended to keep pollutants from contacting site runoff. Examples include "No Dumping-Drains to Creek/River" stencils/stamps on storm drain inlets to educate the public, and providing roofs over areas likely to contain pollutants, so that rainfall does not contact the pollutants. Treatment control measures are intended to remove pollutants that have already been mobilized in runoff. Examples include vegetated swales and water quality detention basins. These facilities slow water down and allow sediments and pollutants

to settle out prior to discharge to receiving waters. Additionally, vegetated facilities provide filtration and pollutant uptake/adsorption. The project proponent should consider the use of "low impact development" techniques to reduce the amount of imperviousness on the site, since this will reduce the volume of runoff and therefore will reduce the size/cost of stormwater quality treatment required. Examples of low impact development techniques include pervious pavement and bioretention facilities.

The County requires developers to utilize the *Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento Region, 2018* (Design Manual) in selecting and designing post-construction facilities to treat runoff from the project. Regardless of project type or size, developers are required to implement the minimum source control measures (Chapter 4 of the Design Manual). Low impact development measures and Treatment Control Measures are required of all projects exceeding the impervious surface threshold defined in Table 3-2 and 3-3 of the Design Manual. Further, depending on project size and location, hydromodification control measures may be required (Chapter 5 of the Design Manual).

Updates and background on the County's requirements for post-construction stormwater quality treatment controls, along with several downloadable publications, can be found at the following websites:

http://www.waterresources.saccounty.net/stormwater/Pages/default.aspx

http://www.beriverfriendly.net/Newdevelopment/

The final selection and design of post-construction stormwater quality control measures is subject to the approval of the County Department of Water Resources; therefore, they should be contacted as early as possible in the design process for guidance.

CONCLUSION

Project compliance with requirements outlined above will ensure that project-related stormwater pollution impacts are *less than significant*.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.
- Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.
- Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies.

- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat.

SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN (SSHCP)

The SSHCP is a regional approach to addressing development, habitat conservation, and agricultural lands within the south Sacramento County region, including the cities of Galt and Rancho Cordova. The specific geographic scope of the SSHCP comprises 317,655 acres within the county. The plan areas boundaries include U.S. Highway 50 to the north, the Sacramento River levee and County Road J11 (also known as the Walnut Grove-Thornton Road) to the west, the Sacramento County line with El Dorado and Amador counties to the east, and San Joaquin County to the south. The SSHCP Project area excludes the City of Sacramento, the City of Folsom, the City of Elk Grove, most of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and the Sacramento community of Rancho Murieta.

The SSHCP covers 28 different species of plants and wildlife, including 10 that are state and/or federally-listed as threatened or endangered. The SSHCP has been developed as a collaborative effort to streamline permitting and protect covered species habitat.

On May 15, 2018, the Final SSHCP and EIS/EIR was published in the federal Register for a 30-day review period. Public hearings on the proposed adoption of the final SSHCP, final EIS/EIR, final Aquatic Resources Plan (ARP), and final Implementation Agreement (IA) began in August 2018, and adoption by the County occurred on September 11, 2018. The permit was received on June 12, 2019 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, July 25, 2019 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and August 20, 2019 from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The proposed project is in the Urban Development Area (UDA) and considered a covered activity in the SSHCP; therefore, the project must comply with the provisions of the SSHCP and associated permits. The analysis below addresses the applicability of the SSHCP, and mitigation has been designed to comply with the SSHCP.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE SSHCP

The proposed project's design and construction must comply with all SSHCP requirements including SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs). The SSHCP is a habitat-based plan in which mitigation fees are based on impacts to habitat or land cover rather than impacts to individual species. Baseline, land cover maps were established utilizing remote sensing analyses over a number of years prior to adoption of the SSHCP. The baseline land covers are intended to serve as a guide to for potential habitat present on the project site and are intended to be updated with pedestrian-level biological surveys. Plate IS-2 depicts the baseline, land cover types for the project site. Plate IS-3 depicts the updated land cover types following biological surveys by Sycamore.

The baseline, land cover maps contained several land cover types including freshwater marsh, low-density development, streams/creeks (VPIH), swales, vernal pools, and valley grasslands. The updated land cover map refined the land cover types and associated areas. The proposed improvements shown in Plate IS-1 will result in impacts to valley grassland, swales, and vernal pool cover types.

The analysis contained in this chapter is consistent with the protocol for covered species analysis under the SSHCP. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure that impacts to covered species and their habitat will be less than significant. The mitigation contained in this chapter has been structured such that the required mitigation is consistent with the adopted SSHCP mitigation and monitoring protocols.

The applicant will be required to obtain a signed SSHCP authorization form from the Environmental Coordinator for potential impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitats. During the local impact authorization process, impact fees will be calculated utilizing the updated land cover data. The project will comply with the requirements of the SSHCP, including adherence to the Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix A), as well as payment of fees to support the overall SSHCP Conservation Strategy. Thus, the project is consistent with, and aids in the goals set forth in the proposed SSHCP.

CONCLUSION

Impacts relating to consistency with the proposed SSHCP are considered *less than significant*.



Plate IS-2: SSHCP Baseline Land Cover Map

Plate IS-3: Updated Land Cover Map



SURVEYS AND METHODOLOGY

Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. (Sycamore) prepared a biological resources evaluation report on behalf of the applicant. Studies included biological field surveys, a botanical survey a wetland delineation, and an arborist survey. Sycamore reviewed and analyzed a variety of data from state and federal agencies. A list of special-status species known or with potential to occur on the project site or in the immediate vicinity was developed from database queries of USFWS' Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC), CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare Plant Inventory. Significance findings have been based on the impact conclusions of applicable surveys and studies. In absence of such published documents, the analyses rely on the general definitions of significance.

SURVEYS AND STUDIES

The following technical studies were submitted and/or utilized as part of the biological resources analysis for this project:

- Biological Resources Evaluation Report for the Excelsior Ranch Project (Appendix B)
- South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP)

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

The likelihood of a special status species to be present on the project site was determined using the technical studies/documents listed above, and topical literature as cited. Species considered for presence are those species with modeled habitat identified in the SSHCP and species considered with potential occurence as indicated on the official USFWS species list, CNDDB quad queries, CNPS queries. This is the basis for species outlined in Table IS-4 and Table IS-5, which report the likelihood of species occurrence based on habitat presence either on the site or in proximity of the site, survey results (if any), and nearby recorded species occurrences. Likelihood of occurrence is rated as Not Expected to Occur, Could Occur, and Known to Occur, which are defined as:

Not Expected to Occur: Species is unlikely to be present on the project site due to poor habitat quality, lack of suitable habitat features, or restricted current distribution of the species.

Could Occur: Suitable habitat is available on the project site; however, there are little to no other indicators that the species might be present.

Known to Occur: The species, or evidence of its presence, was observed on the project site during project surveys, or was otherwise documented.

Species with a Not Expected to Occur designation are not discussed further in subsequent analysis sections.

SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS

Table IS-4 provides a list of the special-status plant species with potential to occur based upon the available data from USFWS' IPaC, CNNDB, CNPS, and species covered by the SSHCP. The table describes their regulatory status, habitat, and potential for occurrence on the project site. Rationale for potential for occurrence was taken from the project's biological report, prepared by Sycamore.

0	Status ¹			Heblied and Discoving Dadad	Data #14 - 0		
Species	USFWS	CDFW	CRPR	Habitat and Biooming Period			
Ahart's dwarf rush Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii	_	_	1B.2	An annual herb found in mesic valley and foothill grassland from 100 to 750 feet. Blooms March - May (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. Suitable habitat for this species is present on the project site and two known occurrences are present within five miles of the project site. Ahart's dwarf rush was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for this species.		
Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop Gratiola heterosepala	_	Е	1B.2	L A state-endangered annual herb found in clay soils along margins of lakes, marshes, swamps, and in vernal pools from 33 to 7,792 feet. Blooms from April - June (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. Suitable habitat is present on site and 10 known CNNDB occurrences within the nine-quad area; the closest occurrence is from 1998, approximately 800 feet north of the project site and is considered extirpated. The species was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for the species.		
Dwarf downingia Downingia pusilla	_	-	2B.2	An annual herb found in mesic valley and foothill grassland and vernal pools from 3 to 1,500 feet. Blooms March - May (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. Suitable habitat is present on site; however, the species was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for the species. There are four known CNDDB occurrences within the nine-quad area; the closest occurrence is located approximately 3.6 miles to the southwest.		
Legenere Legenere limosa	_	-	1B.1	Relatively deep and wet vernal pools below 3,000 feet elevation. Blooms April – June (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. 28 known occurrences are located within the nine-quad area; the nearest occurs is approximately 1.4 mile northwest of the project area. The species was not observed during the evident and identifiable period for the species.		
Pinchushion navarretia Navarretia myersii ssp. myersii	-	_	1B.1	An annual herb found in vernal pools, often with acidic conditions; 65 to 1,100 feet elevation. Blooms April – May (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. No known records in the nine- quad area. The species was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for this species. Habitat for this species is marginal due to the limited depth and hydroperiod of the vernal pools and swales in the BSA.		

Table IS-4: Special-Status Plant Species and Potential for Occurrence

Species	Status 1			Habitat and Planning Daried	D.4. (14. 0	
	USFWS	CDFW	CRPR	Habitat and Blooming Period	Potential for Occurrence-	
Sacramento Orcutt grass Orcuttia viscida	E	E	1B.1	Vernal pools; 98 to 328 feet elevation. Blooms April–July (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. There are eight known occurrences within the nine-quad area; the closes of which is located approximately 2.6 miles north of the project site. The species was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for this species. Habitat for this species is marginal due to the limited depth and hydroperiod of the vernal pools and swales in the BSA. The BSA is not in or near designated critical habitat for Sacramento Orcutt grass.	
Slender Orcutt grass Orcuttia tenuis	E	E	1B.1	Annual herb found in vernal pools, often those with gravelly substrate, from 115 to 5,800 ft. Blooms May – October (CNPS 2019).	Not expected to occur. There are three known occurrences in the nine-quad area; the closest occurrence was recorded approximately 0.7 miles north of the project area. he species was not observed during the May 2018 botanical survey conducted during the evident and identifiable period for this species. Habitat for this species is marginal due to the limited depth and hydroperiod of the vernal pools and swales in the BSA.	

Table IS-4: Special-Status Plant Species and Potential for Occurrence

Notes: USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife; CRPR = California Rare Plant Rank; CNDDB = California Natural Diversity Database; ESA = Federal Endangered Species Act; CESA = California Endangered Species Act ¹ Legal Status Definitions

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:	California Rare Plant Ranks:
E Endangered (legally protected) T Threatened (legally protected)	1B Plant species considered rare or endangered in California and elsewhere (protected under CEQA, but not legally protected under ESA or CESA)
California Department of Fish and Game:	2 Plant species considered rare or endangered in California but more common elsewhere (protected under CEQA, but not legally protected under ESA or CESA)
E Endangered (legally protected)	CRPR Extensions:
	.1 Seriously endangered in California (>80% of occurrences are threatened and/or high degree and immediacy of threat)
	.2 Fairly endangered in California (20 to 80% of occurrences are threatened)

²Potential for Occurrence Definitions

Not expected to occur: Species is unlikely to be present on the project site due to poor habitat quality, lack of suitable habitat features, or species not detected by surveys during blooming period.

Could occur: Suitable habitat is available on the project site; however, there are little to no other indicators that the species might be present. Sources: Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc., CDFW 2019, CNDDB 2019, CNPS 2019

Sycamore's botanical survey was conducted in May 2018, during the evident and identifiable period for each of the species listed in Table IS-4. Although suitable habitat for several of the species can be found on the project site, none of the species were detected in the BSA.

CONCLUSION

No special-status plant species were observed within the project area during biological surveys; surveys were conducted during the evident and identifiable period for this species. As a covered activity under the SSHCP, the project will be required to comply

with the AMMs specific to special-status plant species. With compliance with the SSHCP, impacts to special-status plant are considered *less than significant*.

SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE

Table IS-4 provides a list of the special-status plant species with potential to occur based upon the available data from USFWS' IPaC, CNNDB, Sycamore's biological report, and species covered by the SSHCP. The table describes their regulatory status, habitat, and potential for occurrence on the project site.

Species	Listing Status ¹		Habitat	Potential for Occurrence ²		
opeoida	Federal	State	, and the second s			
Invertebrates	P alatkanyaki					
Midvalley fairy shrimp Branchinecta mesovallensis	-		Inhabit shallow vernal pools, vernal swales, and various artificial ephemeral wetland habitats in the Sacramento (SSHCP 2018).	Could occur. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. No records of this species occur in the BSA, but 26 occurrences are listed in the nine- quad area, with the closest record located approximately 0.25 miles east of the site. Further discussion below.		
Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle <i>Hydrochara rickseckeri</i>		. –	The species is an aquatic beetle dependent upon wetland habitats. They require seasonally inundated vernal pools and depressional wetlands that remain inundated for a minimum of 18 days in all but the driest years (SSHCP 2018).	Could occur. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. The species was not observed during biological surveys; however, two CNDDB records are located within the nine-quad area, with the closest occurrence four miles north of the site. Further discussion below.		
Vernal pool fairy shrimp Branchinecta lynchi	Т	_	Vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands in valley and foothill grasslands. Tends to occur in smaller wetland features (less than 0.05 acre in size) (USFWS 1994).	Could occur. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. There are 75 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest record occurs on the adjacent parcel on the west side of Excelsior Road. The vernal pools and swales provide only marginal habitat for VPFS since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for a sufficient period for VPFS to reproduce. Further discussion below.		
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp Lepidurus packardi	E	_	Vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands in valley and foothill grasslands that pond for sufficient duration to allow the species to complete its life cycle. Typically found in ponds ranging from 0.1 to 80 acres in size (USFWS 1994).	Could occur. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. There are 93 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest occurrence, from 1993, on an area immediately west of the BSA. Much of that area has since been developed and surveys in 2005 negative. The species was not observed during the May 2018 biological surveys. Further discussion below.		

Table IS-5: Special-Status Wildlife and Potential for Occurrence

Amphibians and Reptiles

Spaciae	Listing Status ¹		Habitat	Potential for Occurrence?	
opecies	Federal	State		Potentiarior Occurrence	
Western spadefoot Spea hammondii	-	SC	Vernal pools and other seasonal ponds with a minimum three-week inundation period in valley and adjacent foothill grasslands.	Could occur. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. There are seven CNDDB records within the nine-quad area. The closest occurrence, from 1994, is approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the BSA. The species was not observed during the May 2018 biological surveys. Further discussion below.	
Birds					
Burrowing owl <i>Athene cunicularia</i> (burrow sites)	-	SC	Nests and forages in grasslands, agricultural lands, open shrublands, and open woodlands with existing ground squirrel burrows or friable soils. Suitable burrow sites consist of short, herbaceous vegetation with only sparse cover of shrubs or taller herbs (Shuford and Gardali 2008: 221).	Not expected to occur. The lack of rodent burrows on-site rules out burrowing owls being present on the site. There are 43 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The nearest occurrence, from 2003, is approximately 1.3 miles north of the site. The species was not observed during May 2018 biological surveys.	
Cooper's hawk Accipiter cooperi	_	_	Nests in a wide variety of woodland and forest habitats. Dense stands of live oak, deciduous riparian, or other forest habitats near water are preferred. Nests are placed in deciduous trees in crotches 10-80 ft above the ground (CWHR 2019).	Could occur. No potential nesting habitat for species within the BSA. There are six known CNDDB records within the nine-quad area; closest record, from 1997, is approximately 2 miles northwest of the site. The species was not observed during biological surveys. Unlikely that nesting would occur nearby since there are no live oak, deciduous riparian, or other forest habitats near water anywhere close to the BSA. This species could forage within the BSA. Further discussion below.	
Ferruginous hawk <i>Buteo regalis</i>	-	_	Forages in large, open tracts of grasslands, sparse scrubland, and deserts. It frequents open grasslands, sagebrush flats, desert scrub, low foothills and surrounding valleys, and fringes of pinyon-juniper habitats. Nesting occurs in lone trees or on telephone poles; species is not known to breed in California (CWHR 2019).	Could occur. The site's valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provide suitable habitat. There are three CNDDB records in the nine- quad area; the closest record, from 1991, is located approximately 4.3 miles north of the BSA. Potential raptor nests were not observed in or near the BSA. The species may forage in the BSA. Further discussion below.	
Loggerhead shrike <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	_	SC	Nests in a densely-foliaged shrub or tree. Prefers open grasslands or scrub with shrubs or trees and low, sparse herbaceous cover with perches available (fences, posts, utility lines). In California, the critical nesting season in is from March into August (CHWR 2019).	Could occur. The valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provides suitable foraging habitat. There are no known CNDDB records of loggerhead shrike in the nine-quad area or in Sacramento County; however, this species is frequently observed in open grasslands in the Central Valley, including portions of Sacramento County as indicated by eBird (2019) observations. The species was not observed during biological surveys.	

Snecies	Listing Status ¹		Habitat	Potential for Occurrence ²	
operies	Federal	State	- iautat	Potential for Occurrence-	
		undi con pitalga de		Further discussion below.	
Northern harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	_	SC	Breed and forage in a variety of open (treeless) habitats that provide adequate vegetative cover, an abundance of suitable prey, and scattered hunting, plucking, and lookout perches such as shrubs and fence posts. Habitats include freshwater marshes, brackish and saltwater marshes, wet meadows, weedy borders of lakes, rivers and streams, annual and perennial grasslands, vernal pool complexes, weed fields, ungrazed or lightly grazed pastures, low-growing crop fields, sagebrush flats, and desert sinks (Shuford and Gardali 2008).	Could occur. The valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provides suitable foraging habitat. There are no known CNDDB records of northern harrier in the nine-quad area or in Sacramento County; however, this species is frequently observed throughout Sacramento County as indicated by eBird (2019) observations. No nesting habitat is present within the BSA. The species was not observed on or near the BSA, during biological surveys, but may forage in the BSA. Further discussion below.	
Swainson's hawk Buteo swainsoni	_	т	Forages in grasslands and agricultural lands; nests in riparian and isolated trees.	Could occur. There are 181 CNDDB occurrences within the nine-quad area. Closes occurrence, from 2009, is located approximately 1.20 miles southwest of the project site. No nests were observed on or near the site; however, the large eucalyptus trees in the southern portion of the BSA and or the parcel to the south provide suitable habitat. Many large trees suitable for nesting occur within a mile. The species could utilize valley grasslands present for foraging. Further discussion below.	
Tricolored blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i> (nesting colony)	_	E	Forages in agricultural lands and grasslands; nests in marshes, riparian scrub, and other areas that support cattails or dense thickets of shrubs or herbs. Requires open water and protected nesting substrate, such as flooded, spiny, or thorny vegetation (Schuford and Gardali 2008: 439).	Could occur. The site contains no potential nesting habitat, but does provide potential habitat for foraging. There are 87 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest record is located approximately 1.4 miles southwest of the site—colony is considered possibly extirpated. No tricolored blackbirds were observed during biological surveys. Further discussion below.	
White-tailed kite Elanus leucurus	_	FP	White-tailed kites occur in herbaceous and open stages of most habitats in cismontane California. Areas with substantial groves of dense, broad- leafed deciduous trees are used for nesting and roosting. Nests are typically located from 20 to 100 feet above the ground near the top of dense oak, willow, or other tree stands, and are often located near an open foraging area with a dense population of voles (CWHR 2019).	Could occur. Large eucalyptus trees along southern edge of the BSA could potentially provide marginal nesting habitat. There are 18 known CNDDB records within the 9-quad area with the closest record, from 1990, located 3.30 miles north of the BSA. No white-tailed kites or potential nests were found on-site or near the BSA, during biological surveys. Valley grasslands on-site provide potential foraging habitat. Further discussion below.	

•

.

Species		Listing	Status ¹	Habitat	Potential for Occurrence ²		
•	Fede		State	radiut.			
Federal:	<u></u>		State:				
E	Endangered (legally	l i i	D Delisted				
protected)			FP	Fully protected (legally protected)			
T	Threatened (legally	protected)	SC	Species of special concern (no formal protection other than CEQA consideration)			
D Delisted			E	Endangered (legally protected)			
	10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -		T	Threatened (legally protected)			
² Potential for	or Occurrence Definiti	ions					
Not expecte	ed to occur: Species is	s unlikely to	be present	on the project site due to poor habitat quality, lac	k of suitable habitat features, or restricted current		

distribution of the species. Could occur: Suitable habitat is available on the project site; however, there are little to no other indicators that the species might be present. Known to occur: The species, or evidence of its presence, was observed on the project site during project surveys, or was otherwise documented. Source: Sycamore Environmental Consultants 2019, CDFW 2019, CNDDB 2019, USFWS 2019

As noted in Table IS-5, several special-status species and SSHCP cover species have the potential to occur in the BSA. Species not expected to occur will not be discussed further. Species with potential to occur are discussed below.

VERNAL POOL CRUSTACEANS

There are a variety of invertebrate species that rely on vernal pools and similar seasonal wetland habitat. Species associated with vernal pools include midvalley fairy shrimp, vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle. All of the species spend their life cycle within the margins of the vernal pool. None of these species is readily observed through casual observation. Thus, lack of recorded sightings is not cause to conclude that the species is not present. If suitable habitat is present, the species should be assumed to be present unless surveys have found the species to be absent. Discussion of the midvalley fairy shrimp, vernal pool fairy shrimp, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp are grouped under the heading of Vernal Pool Crustaceans, because the survey protocols and mitigation requirements are applied to all four species. As previously stated, the SSHCP is a habitat based plan; therefore, the mitigation fee for impacted land covers is required regardless of surveys that demonstrate the presence or absence of the species typically known to use the land cover type as habitat. Surveys do help define the land cover type and identify applicable AMMs.

Vernal pool habitats may be subject to either direct or indirect impacts. Indirect impacts may be caused because development in proximity of a vernal pool could deliver runoff polluted with urban contaminants and introduce non-native species associated with development landscaping. Development may also reduce the size of the watershed, which supports the vernal pool, by diverting runoff that once went into the vernal pool into a storm drainage system. This watershed reduction could cause a reduction in the depth and/or duration of ponding. Shorter inundation durations may mean a change in pool temperature, depth, and pH. Features that may have been utilized by species that required specific inundation durations for the completion of breeding cycles may no longer provide suitable habitat. The programmatic consultation indicates that all habitats within 250 feet of proposed development may be subject to indirect impacts. The same

approach is being used to assess onsite indirect impacts to vernal pools within the SSHCP. Thus, all development must occur a minimum of 250 feet from the margin of any vernal pool in order to achieve total avoidance of impacts, unless a lesser buffer is approved by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Indirect impacts to preserves is calculated using a modeled watershed approach under the SSHCP. The project is not expected to impact existing or known proposed preserves.

The SSHCP assumes all modeled habitat to be potential habitat for vernal pool crustaceans, including vernal pools, seasonal wetlands and swales. A direct impact is the filling or excavation of a vernal pool. The SSHCP specifies that if filling or excavation occurs within any portion of a vernal pool, the entire vernal pool should be considered directly impacted.

The SSHCP permit strategy relies on the USFWS biological opinion (BO) that includes all future SSHCP covered activities requiring a CWA 404 permit, eliminating the need for individual project-by-project consultations under ESA Section 7. Compensatory mitigation for the loss of vernal pool habitat is satisfied through the SSHCP by purchasing credits from the South Sacramento In-lieu Fee (ILF) Program. The ILF program was established compliant with the 2008 federal mitigation rule (33 CFR Part 332), and is fully synergized with the SSHCP's fees for the applicable land cover type (e.g., vernal pools). The ILF program utilizes the compensatory mitigation ratio requirements for aquatic resources required by the SSHCP, which consist of a 1:1 ratio of re-establishment/establishment (i.e., net gain) with respect to loss, for all potential waters of the U.S. In addition to the ILF program, the SSHCP mitigation fees provide funding for habitat preservation to mitigate (1:1) for direct and/or indirect impacts to SSHCP covered species habitat.

VERNAL POOL FAIRY SHRIMP

Vernal pool fairy shrimp (VPFS) is listed as a federally threatened species. The species inhabits small swales, earth slumps or basalt-flow depressions with grassy or muddy bottoms in unplowed grasslands, but are also found in water pooled in sandstone outcrops and in alkaline vernal pools. Pools can vary in size from 0.1 to 0.5 acres, but must remain inundated for at least three weeks for vernal pool fairy shrimp to complete their life cycles.

The species has the potential to occur, as the site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. The vernal pools provide only marginal habit since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for a sufficient period for VPFS to reproduce. The BSA is not located in within or near a designated critical habitat for VPFS. There are 75 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest record occurs on the adjacent parcel on the west side of Excelsior Road.

MIDVALLEY FAIRY SHRIMP

Midvalley fairy shrimp (MVFS) is a CNDDB species with a state rank of S2 and a global rank of G2. The species inhabits seasonal pools, earth slumps or sandstone

depressions with old alluvial soils in unplowed grasslands. All pools must remain inundated for at least three weeks for MVFS to complete their life cycles.

MVFS could occur within the vernal pools and swales on site. The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. The vernal pools provide only marginal habit since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for a sufficient period for VPFS to reproduce. No records of this species occur in the BSA, but 26 occurrences are listed in the 9-quad area, with the closest record located approximately 0.25 miles east of the site. No water was present in any of the aquatic features during biological surveys.

VERNAL POOL TADPOLE SHRIMP

Vernal pool tadpole shrimp (VPTS) is listed as a federally endangered species. The species inhabits seasonal wetlands and vernal pool complexes, but can also be found in stock ponds and roadside ditches. Pools can vary in size from extremely small to large winter lakes, and can be clear and well vegetated to highly turbid alkali scald ponds. All pools must remain inundated for at least three weeks for vernal pool tadpole shrimp to complete their life cycles.

VPTS could occur within the vernal pools and swales on site, since they provide marginal habitat for the species. The vernal pools and swales provide only marginal habitat for VPTS since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for a sufficient period for VPTS to reproduce. The extent and duration of inundation, and therefore VPFS habitat suitability, will vary from year to year depending on precipitation, temperature, etc. There are 93 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest occurrence, from 1993, on an area immediately west of the BSA. Much of that area has since been developed and surveys in 2005 negative. The species was not observed during the May 2018 biological surveys. No records of VPTS occur in the BSA, but there are nearby records as noted above. The BSA is not in or near designated critical habitat for VPTS.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

As discussed earlier, the improvements shown on the proposed tentative parcel map would result in either direct or indirect impacts to all of the vernal pool swales on site. Since vernal pool crustaceans have the potential to occur within these features, compensatory mitigation will be required. Compensatory mitigation for the loss of vernal pool habitat is satisfied through the SSHCP by purchasing credits from the South Sacramento ILF Program.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and the purchasing of credits from the South Sacramento ILF Program will ensure impacts are *less than significant*.

RICKSECKER'S WATER SCAVENGER BEETLE

The Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle (RWSB) is an HCP covered species and does not have a state or federal listing status. The species is an aquatic beetle that requires seasonally inundated vernal pools and depressional wetlands that remain inundated for a minimum of 18 days in all but the driest years. The species was originally described as endemic to the San Francisco Bay region, but recent collections have been made in Solano County and from vernal pools in Sacramento and Placer counties. In the Central Valley, suitable habitat occurs below 980 feet. It is listed primarily due to its association with in-decline habitats, rather than based on known population trends. The beetle is known to co-occur with vernal pool fairy shrimp.

RWSB could occur within the vernal pools and swales on site, since they provide marginal habitat for the species. The species was not observed during biological surveys; however, two CNDDB records are located within the nine-quad area, with the closest occurrence four miles north of the site. The vernal pools and swales provide only marginal habitat for RWSB since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for a sufficient period for RWSB to reproduce. The extent and duration of inundation, and therefore RWSB habitat suitability, will vary from year to year depending on precipitation, temperature, etc.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Improvements shown on the proposed tentative parcel map would result in either direct or indirect impacts to all of the vernal pool swales on site. Since the species has the potential to occur within these features, compensatory mitigation will be required. Compensatory mitigation for the loss of vernal pool habitat is satisfied through the SSHCP by purchasing credits from the South Sacramento ILF Program.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and the purchasing of credits from the South Sacramento ILF Program will ensure impacts are *less than significant*.

Western Spadefoot

The western spadefoot (Scaphiopus (Spea) hammondii) occurs in shallow, seasonal wetlands in valley and foothill habitats such as grasslands, open chaparral, sage scrubland, short-grass plains, and pine woodlands. Spadefoot occur in both grazed and ungrazed habitat. Adult spadefoot occupy burrows up to three feet in depth in upland habitat during dry periods to avoid desiccation. Individuals may remain in these burrows for eight to nine months. Most surface activity is nocturnal. The spadefoot leave their upland burrows for wetlands during the breeding season, which lasts from January to August, depending on rainfall. It appears that vernal pools and other temporary wetlands may be optimal for breeding due to the absence or reduced abundance of both native and nonnative predators (bullfrogs, fish, and crawfish), many of which require more permanent water sources. Current research on amphibian conservation suggests that average habitat utilization falls within 1,200 feet of aquatic habitats¹.

¹ United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2005. Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon. Portland, Oregon.

The site's vernal pools and swales provide marginal habitat for the species. The vernal pools and swales provide only marginal habitat for western spadefoot since these features are shallow, dry in early spring, and may not hold water continuously for 30 continuous days as required for western spadefoot reproduction. There are seven CNDDB records within the nine-quad area. The closest occurrence, from 1994, is approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the BSA. The species was not observed during the May 2018 biological surveys.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Construction activities related to grading and paving have the potential to impact the species. To avoid direct and indirect effects of covered activities on western spadefoot compliance with the SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs) associated with the species will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for western spadefoot will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

COOPER'S HAWK

Cooper's hawk nests in a wide variety of woodland and forest habitats. Dense stands of live oak, deciduous riparian, or other forest habitats near water are preferred. Nests are placed in deciduous trees in crotches 10-80 feet above the ground (CWHR 2019). Findings in a 1987 study of Cooper's hawk in California indicate that most nests occur in groves of six or more trees. Cooper's hawks appear tolerant of habitat fragmentation and human disturbance near the nest. Urban nest sites have included trees within 492 feet of commercial and recreational activities, and within 66 to 98 feet of residential houses. Pairs often reuse the same nest sites over consecutive years.

There is no potential nesting habitat for species within the BSA. There are six known CNDDB records within the nine-quad area; closest record, from 1997, is approximately two miles northwest of the site. The species was not observed during biological surveys. It is unlikely that nesting would occur nearby since there are no live oak, deciduous riparian, or other forest habitats near water anywhere close to the BSA; however, the species could forage within the BSA.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Potential nesting habitat for the species does not exist within or adjacent to the project site; however, development of the parcel would result in a loss of foraging habitat (valley grassland). Since the site contains modeled habitat for the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

Ferruginous hawk

This species forages in large, open tracts of grasslands, sparse scrubland, and deserts. It frequents open grasslands, sagebrush flats, desert scrub, low foothills and surrounding valleys, and fringes of pinyon-juniper habitats. Nesting occurs in lone trees or on telephone poles. Prey includes lagomorphs, ground squirrels, and mice, although it will also take birds, reptiles, and amphibians. This species is not known to breed in California; however, the species may forage within habitat on-site.

The species could occur on site, as the site's valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provide suitable foraging habitat. There are three CNDDB records in the nine-quad area; the closest record, from 1991, is located approximately 4.3 miles north of the BSA. Potential raptor nests were not observed in or near the BSA.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Potential nesting habitat for the species does not exist within or adjacent to the project site; however, development of the parcel would result in a loss of foraging habitat (valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales).

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors will ensure impacts to ferruginous hawk are *less than significant*.

Loggerhead shrike

According to the California Fish and Wildlife Life History Account for the loggerhead shrike (Lanius Iudovicianus), the species breeds mainly in shrublands or open woodlands with a fair amount of grass cover and areas of bare ground. They require tall shrubs or trees (they also use fences or power lines) for hunting perches, territorial advertisement, and pair maintenance; open areas of short grasses, forbs, or bare ground for hunting; and large shrubs or trees for nest placement. They also need impaling sites for prey manipulation or storage, which can include sharp, thorny, or multistemmed plants and barbed-wire fences. The breeding season for this species begins in mid-March to early April and extends to July. The species is listed as a California Species of Special Concern due to loss of nesting habitat.

The valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provides suitable foraging habitat. There are no known CNDDB records of loggerhead shrike in the nine-quad area or in Sacramento County; however, this species is frequently observed in open grasslands in the Central Valley, including portions of Sacramento County as indicated by eBird (2019) observations. The species was not observed during biological surveys.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Potential nesting habitat for the species does not exist within or adjacent to the project site; however, development of the parcel would result in a loss of foraging habitat (valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales). Since the site contains modeled habitat for the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required. Although the

species is not a raptor, it is grouped in with the raptor AMMs because of its use of impaling sites.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

Northern Harrier

Northern harriers breed and forage in a variety of open (treeless) habitats that provide adequate vegetative cover, an abundance of suitable prey, and scattered hunting, plucking, and lookout perches such as shrubs and fence posts. In California, such habitats include freshwater marshes, brackish and saltwater marshes, wet meadows, weedy borders of lakes, rivers and streams, annual and perennial grasslands, vernal pool complexes, weed fields, ungrazed or lightly grazed pastures, low- growing crop fields, sagebrush flats, and desert sinks (Shuford and Gardali 2008). Northern harriers feed mostly on voles and other small mammals, birds, frogs, small reptiles, crustaceans, insects, and rarely on fish (CWHR 2019). Northern harriers nest on the ground, mostly at marsh edge of emergent wetlands or along rivers or lakes (CWHR 2019), and generally within patches of dense vegetation in undisturbed areas (Shuford and Gardali 2008). They may also nest in grasslands, grain fields, or on sagebrush flats several miles from water.

The site does not containing potential nesting habitat for the species; however, the valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales provides suitable foraging habitat. There are no known CNDDB records of northern harrier in the nine-quad area or in Sacramento County; however, this species is frequently observed throughout Sacramento County as indicated by eBird (2019) observations. No nesting habitat is present within the BSA. The species was not observed on or near the BSA, during biological surveys, but may forage in the BSA.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Potential nesting habitat for the species does not exist within or adjacent to the project site; however, development of the parcel would result in a loss of foraging habitat (valley grassland, vernal pools, and swales). Since the site contains modeled habitat for the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

Swainson's Hawk

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed as a threatened species by the State and is a covered species under the SSHCP. It is a migratory raptor typically nesting in or near valley floor riparian habitats during spring and summer months. Swainson's hawks were once common throughout the state, but various habitat changes, including the loss of nesting habitat (trees) and the loss of foraging habitat through the conversion of native Central Valley grasslands to certain incompatible agricultural and urban uses has caused an estimated 90% decline in their population.

There are 181 CNDDB occurrences within the nine-quad area. The closest occurrence, from 2009, is located approximately 1.20 miles southwest of the project site. No nests were observed on or near the site; however, the large eucalyptus trees in the southern portion of the BSA and on the parcel to the south provide suitable habitat. Additionally, many large trees suitable for nesting occur within a mile. The species could utilize valley grasslands present for foraging.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Suitable habitat is present for nesting and foraging on and near the project site. Construction activities associated with the proposed project will result in the loss of potential foraging habitat. In order to avoid potential impacts to the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for Swainson's hawk will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for Swainson's hawk will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD

The tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) is protected under the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503 and 3800). In March 2019, tricolored blackbird was listed as a state threatened species. Reasons for decline of tri-colored blackbird populations include loss of nesting and foraging habitat. According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Life History Account for the tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), the species is mostly a resident in California, and common locally throughout the Central Valley. The species is a colonial nester that breeds near fresh water, preferably in emergent wetland with tall, dense cattails or tules, but also in thickets of willow, blackberry, wild rose, and tall herbs. Nesting colonies usually support a minimum of 50 pairs. The species feeds in grassland and cropland habitats. The usual breeding season is mid-April into late July.

The site contains no potential nesting habitat, but does provide potential habitat for foraging. There are 87 CNDDB records in the 9-quad area. The closest occurrence record is located approximately 1.4 miles southwest of the site— colony is considered possibly extirpated. No tricolored blackbirds were observed during biological surveys.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Grading and development of the site will result in a loss of potential foraging habitat for the species. Since the site contains modeled habitat for the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for tricolored blackbird will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for tricolored blackbird will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

WHITE-TAILED KITE

White-tailed kite is a CDFW fully protected species. White-tailed kites occur in herbaceous and open stages of most habitats in cismontane California. Areas with substantial groves of dense, broad-leafed deciduous trees are used for nesting and roosting. They also roost in saltgrass and Bermuda grass in southern California. White-tailed kite breeds from February to October, with peak activity from May to August. Nests are typically located from 20 to 100 feet above the ground near the top of dense oak, willow, or other tree stands, and are often located near an open foraging area with a dense population of voles (CWHR 2019).

No white-tailed kites or potential nests were observed during biological surveys. Large eucalyptus trees along southern edge of the BSA could potentially provide marginal nesting habitat. There are 18 known CNDDB records within the 9-quad area, with the closest record, from 1990, located 3.30 miles north of the BSA. No white-tailed kites or potential nests were found on-site or near the BSA, during biological surveys. Valley grasslands on-site provide potential foraging habitat.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Grading and development of the site will result in a loss of potential foraging habitat for the species. Additionally, grading of the access road near the eucalyptus trees along the southern edge of the BSA could potentially disturb nesting white-tailed kites. Since the site contains modeled habitat for the species, compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required.

CONCLUSION

Participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors will ensure that potential impacts to the species are *less than significant*.

MIGRATORY NESTING BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which states "unless and except as permitted by regulations, it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill" a migratory bird. Section 3(18) of FESA defines the term "take" means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Causing a bird to abandon an active nest may cause harm to egg(s) or chick(s) and is therefore considered "take." To avoid take of nesting migratory birds, minimization measures have been included to require that activities either occur outside of the nesting season, or to require that nests be buffered from construction activities until the nesting season is concluded.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Suitable tree habitat is present throughout the project site and adjacent properties. Preconstruction surveys for migratory nesting birds will be required if work is to commence between February 1 and August 31. The purpose of the survey requirement is to ensure that construction activities do not agitate or harm nesting migratory birds, potentially resulting in nest abandonment or other harm to nesting success.

CONCLUSION

Recommended mitigation measures will ensure impacts to migratory nesting birds are *less than significant*.

WETLANDS AND OTHER SURFACE WATERS

Federal and state regulation (Clean Water Act Sections 404 and 401) uses the term "surface water" to refer to all standing or flowing water which is present above ground perennially or seasonally. There are many types of surface waters, but the two major groupings are linear waterways with a bed and bank (streams, rivers, etc.) and wetlands. The Clean Water Act has defined the term wetland to mean "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions". The term "wetlands" includes a diverse assortment of habitats such as perennial and seasonal freshwater marshes, vernal pools, and wetted swales. The 1987 Army Corps Wetlands Delineation Manual is used to determine whether an area meets the technical criteria for a wetland and is therefore subject to local, State or Federal regulation of that habitat type. A delineation verification by the Army Corps will verify the size and condition of the wetlands and other waters in question, and will help determine the extent of government jurisdiction.

Wetlands are regulated by both the federal and state government, pursuant to the Clean Water Act Section 404 (federal) and Section 401 (state). The United States Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) is generally the lead agency for the federal permit process, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) is generally the lead agency for the state permit process. The Clean Water Act protects all "navigable waters", which are defined as traditional navigable waters that are or were used for commerce, or may be used for interstate commerce; tributaries of covered waters; and wetlands adjacent to covered waters, including tributaries. Isolated wetlands, that is, those wetlands that are not hydrologically connected to other "navigable" surface waters (or their tributaries), are not considered to be subject to the Clean Water Act.

In addition to the Clean Water Act, the state also has jurisdiction over impacts to surface waters through the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which <u>does not</u> require that waters be "navigable". For this reason, Federal non-jurisdictional waters – isolated wetlands – can be regulated by the State of California pursuant to Porter-Cologne.

The Clean Water Act establishes a "no net" loss" policy regarding wetlands for the state and federal governments, and General Plan Policy CO-58 establishes a "no net loss"

policy for Sacramento County. Pursuant to these policies, any wetlands to be excavated or filled require 1:1 mitigation, and construction within the wetlands cannot take place until the appropriate permit(s) have been obtained from the Army Corps, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Regional Water Board, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and any other agencies with authority over surface waters. Any loss of delineated wetlands not mitigated for through the permitting process must be mitigated, pursuant to County policy. Appropriate mitigation may include establishment of a conservation easement over wetlands, purchase of mitigation banking credits, or similar measures.

There are regulatory setbacks established for vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands, which may contain vernal pool crustaceans. The purpose of a setback is to buffer the wetland from the indirect impacts of development, such as polluted runoff. According to the Programmatic Consultation for vernal pool crustaceans, all construction activities must remain a minimum of 250 feet from any vernal pool in order to avoid impacts (refer to the discussion "Vernal Pool Crustaceans"). There is no regulatory setback for other surface waters, but the County Environmental Review Section has typically required a minimum 50-foot setback². Maintenance of these setbacks will avoid indirect impacts to the surface water. A direct impact is the filling or excavation of a surface water. Note: that if filling or excavation occurs within any portion of a swale, vernal pool, or seasonal wetland, the entire feature should be considered directly impacted.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

An aquatic resources delineation report covering the entire parcel was prepared by Sycamore. On January 15, 2019, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers verified a total of 0.453 acre of jurisdictional waters in the biological study area (0.327 acre of seasonal wetland, 0.122 acre of seasonal wetland swale, and 0.004 acre of ephemeral channel; reference Plate IS-3). The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) requires aquatic features to be classified using specific land cover types and definitions. The aquatic features were re-classified as follows:

- 0.327 acre of seasonal wetlands has been reclassified as "vernal pool"
- 0.122 acre of seasonal wetland swale has been reclassified as "swale"
- 0.004 acre of ephemeral channel has been reclassified as "stream/creek VPIH"

The construction of the access road along the southern property line will require grading, the placement of a 42-inch concrete culvert in the swale identified in SS-1a and SS-1b, and placement of permanent fill within vernal pools (VP-7 and VP-8) and SS-2 of

² Research suggests that some of the most common urban runoff pollutants – including sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus – can be filtered over this distance by intervening vegetation. Source: McElfish, James M. et al. 2008. Planner's Guide to Wetland Buffers for Local Governments. Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C.

Plate IS-3. Permanent fill within these features would be considered direct impacts and would require direct impact fees for 0.166 acres of vernal pools and 0.122 acres of swales.

Ground disturbing activities for the grading of the access road and grading for lot #4's driveway and building pad are within 250 feet of VP-1, VP-2, VP-3, VP-4, VP-5, and SW-6. These activities would be calculated as indirect impacts and would require fees be collected for 0.161 acres of vernal pools. Indirect impacts to 0.004 acres of stream/creek (EC-2), located at the western portion of the parcel, would not be assessed, since it is upstream from SS-2. AMMs for streams will be applied for the feature EC-2.

CONCLUSION

By mitigating for loss of wetlands through the SSHCP, impacts to wetland resources will be *less than significant with mitigation*.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Have a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource
- Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) defines cultural resources as historical and unique archaeological resources that meet significance criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. The eligibility criteria of the California Register include the following:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

Under CEQA, lead agencies must consider the effects of their projects on cultural resources.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Natural Investigations Company prepared a cultural report for the project. A cultural resources literature search was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University— Sacramento. The search was conducted to determine if prehistoric or historic cultural resources were previously recorded within the project site and the number and type of cultural resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the site. The NCIC records search indicated four prior studies had been completed within the search radius with one study occurring within the western portion of the project site. No prehistoric or historic-era archaeological or historic built-environment resources have been previously mapped on the site.

Natural Investigations also conducted a pedestrian level survey of the site. No historical or archaeological resources were identified during the survey.

The project is unlikely to impact human remains buried outside of formal cemeteries; however, if human remains are encountered during construction, mitigation is included specifying how to comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e), Sections 5097.97 and 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code.

CONCLUSION

Compliance with the recommended mitigation will ensure potential impacts to cultural resources are *less than significant*.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

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

Under PRC Section 21084.3, public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area may have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources (21080.3.1(a)).

AB-52 CONSULTATION

Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21090.3.1(b)(1), tribal notifications were sent out to participating tribes on November 27, 2019. Correspondence sent to the tribes included a project description, a cultural report prepared by Natural Investigations Company on behalf of the applicant, and supporting map graphics. NIC's report included cultural literature, results of a Sacred Land File and paleontological record searches, an intensive-level pedestrian survey of the APE, and a project effects assessment. Their report concluded no prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources, ethnographic sites, or historic-era built environment resources were identified during the survey and no cultural resources had been previously recorded within the APE. Their report concluded the potential to directly or indirectly affect cultural resources as low.

Written correspondence (email) was received from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) on November 27, 2019, stating that they received the AB-52 package—no further correspondence was received from UAIC.

Correspondence (email) from Wilton Rancheria (Wilton) was received on December 2, 2019 requesting consultation. A conference call was scheduled for January 13, 2020 to discuss the project and potential site sensitivity; however, Wilton did not answer at the scheduled time and a voicemail and follow-up email were sent. Wilton followed-up by email stating they had not received documentation regarding the project. County staff forwarded the original correspondence sent with the enclosed AB-52 package and Wilton's email requesting consultation under AB-52. Wilton sent a follow-up email on January 28, 2020, stating they did not have any concern with the project and wished to conclude consultation.

To avoid construction-related impacts to potential unknown tribal cultural resources, unanticipated discovery mitigation has been incorporated.

CONCLUSION

Compliance with the recommended mitigation will ensure potential impacts to cultural resources are *less than significant*.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure A is critical to ensure that identified significant impacts of the project are reduced to a level of less than significant. Pursuant to Section 15074.1(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, this measure must be adopted exactly as written unless the hearing body or the Environmental Coordinator adopts a written finding that the new measure is equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it in itself will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment.

As the applicant, or applicant's representative, for this project, I acknowledge that project development creates the potential for significant environmental impact and agree to implement the mitigation measures listed below, which are intended to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Applicant <u>[Original Signature on File</u> Date: _____

MITIGATION MEASURE A: COMPLIANCE WITH THE SSHCP

The applicant shall obtain authorization through the SSHCP prior to all ground disturbing activities, on-site and off-site. Authorization under the SSHCP shall include implementation and conformance with all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix A) and payment of fees necessary to mitigate for impacts to species and habitat.

MITIGATION MEASURE B: MIGRATORY BIRD NEST PROTECTION

To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds the following shall apply:

- 1. If construction activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 50 feet of nesting habitat between February 1 and August 31, a survey for active migratory bird nests shall be conducted no more than 14 day prior to construction by a qualified biologist.
- 2. Trees slated for removal shall be removed during the period of September through January, in order to avoid the nesting season. Any trees that are to be removed during the nesting season, which is February through August, shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist and will only be removed if no nesting migratory birds are found.
- 3. If active nest(s) are found in the survey area, a non-disturbance buffer, the size of which has been determined by a qualified biologist, shall be established and maintained around the nest to prevent nest failure. All construction activities shall be avoided within this buffer area until a qualified biologist determines that nestlings have fledged.

MITIGATION MEASURE C: UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

In the event that human remains are discovered in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work shall be halted and the County Coroner contacted. For all other unexpected cultural resources discovered during project construction, work shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist may evaluate the resource encountered.

- 1. Pursuant to Sections 5097.97 and 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, if a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work is to stop and the County Coroner and the Office of Planning and Environmental Review shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, and the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposition of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods.
- 2. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources (excluding human remains) during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery.

A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained at the Applicant's expense to evaluate the significance of the find. If it is determined due to the types of deposits discovered that a Native American monitor is required, the Guidelines for Monitors/Consultants of Native American Cultural, Religious, and Burial Sites as established by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be followed, and the monitor shall be retained at the Applicant's expense.

- a) Work cannot continue within the 100-foot radius of the discovery site until the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources.
- b) If a potentially-eligible resource is encountered, then the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor, Planning and Environmental Review staff, and project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations or total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator as verification that the

provisions of CEQA for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met.

MITIGATION MEASURE COMPLIANCE

Comply with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for this project as follows:

- 1. The proponent shall comply with the MMRP for this project, including the payment of a fee to cover the Office of Planning and Environmental Review staff costs incurred during implementation of the MMRP. The MMRP fee for this project is \$ **3,436.00**. This fee includes administrative costs of \$930.00.
- 2. Until the MMRP has been recorded and the administrative portion of the MMRP fee has been paid, no final parcel map or final subdivision map for the subject property shall be approved. Until the balance of the MMRP fee has been paid, no encroachment, grading, building, sewer connection, water connection or occupancy permit from Sacramento County shall be approved.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed the following Initial Study Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act as follows:

1 Potentially Significant indicates there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

2 Less than Significant with Mitigation applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

3 Less than Significant or No Impact indicates that either a project will have an impact but the impact is considered minor or that a project does not impact the particular resource.

	Potentially	Less Than	Less Than	No Impact	Comments
	Significant	Significant with	Significant		
		Mitigation			
1. LAND USE - Would the project:		an a	0		
a. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			Х		The project is consistent with environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, Vineyard Community Plan, South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP), and Sacramento County Zoning Code.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?				Х	The project will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community.
2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project:					
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?			Х		The project will neither directly nor indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth; the proposal is consistent with existing land use designations.
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Х	The project will not result in the removal of existing housing, and thus will not displace substantial amounts of existing housing.
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the pro-	oject:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?			X		The project site is designated as "Other Land" and "Grazing" on the Sacramento County Important Farmland Map (2016). The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the current Sacramento County Important Farmland Map published by the California Department of Conservation.
 b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract? 				Х	No Williamson Act contracts apply to the project site.

11

•

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
C.	Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?			Х		The project does not occur in an area of agricultural production.
4.	AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a.	Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?				Х	The project does not occur in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.
b.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			х		Construction will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site.
C.	Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		The project will not result in a new source of substantial light, glare or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
5.	AIRPORTS - Would the project:					
a.	Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?				Х	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip safety zones.
b.	Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?				Х	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip noise zones or contours.
C.	Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?				Х	The project does not affect navigable airspace.
d.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				Х	The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
6.	PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:					
a.	Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?			Х		The project site is located within Sacramento County Water Agency's service area. The water service provider has adequate capacity to serve the water needs of the proposed project.
b.	Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?			X		The project site is located outside of Sacramento Area Sewer District's and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District's service areas. The applicant is proposing the construction of private septic systems. Sacramento County Code Chapters 6.28 and 6.32 provide rules and regulations for water wells and septic systems that are designed to protect water quality. The Environmental Health Division of the County Environmental Management Department has permit approval authority for any new water wells and septic systems on the site. Compliance with existing regulations will ensure that impacts are less than significant.
C.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			Х		The Kiefer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2050.
d.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?			Х		Minor extension of infrastructure would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Existing water and electrical service lines are located within existing roadways and other developed areas, and the extension of lines would take place within areas already proposed for development as part of the project. No significant new impacts would result from service line extension.

11

•

c

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?			X		The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities. New storm water drainage facilities are not being proposed at this time. The County Department of Water Resources will review plans for the installation of any on or off-site facilities pursuant to the approved improvement plans, Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards.
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?			Х		Minor extension of utility lines would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Existing utility lines are located along existing roadways and other developed areas, and the extension of lines would take place within areas already proposed for development as part of the project. No significant new impacts would result from utility extension.
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?			Х		The project would incrementally increase demand for emergency services, but would not cause substantial adverse physical impacts as a result of providing adequate service.
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?			Х		The project would result in minor increases to student population; however, the increase would not require the construction/expansion of new unplanned school facilities. Established case law, <i>Goleta Union School District v. The</i> <i>Regents of the University of California</i> (36 Cal-App. 4 th 1121, 1995), indicates that school overcrowding, standing alone, is not a change in the physical conditions, and cannot be treated as an impact on the environment.
 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services? 			Х		The project will result in increased demand for park and recreation services, but meeting this demand will not result in any substantial physical impacts.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
7. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the pro	ject:	Name and and the second			
a. Result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?			Х		The project will result in minor increases in vehicle trips, but this increase will not cause, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County to be exceeded.
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?			Х		No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project. The project will be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code. Upon compliance, impacts are less than significant.
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?			X		No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project; therefore no impacts to public safety on area roadways will result. The project will be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code. Upon compliance, impacts are less than significant.
d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X	The project does not conflict with alternative transportation policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, with the Sacramento Regional Transit Master Plan, or other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.
8. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:					
a. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		The project does not exceed the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment. Refer to Air Quality section.

- 11

۰.

•

1

		······				
		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b.	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?				Х	There are no sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, nursing homes, hospitals, daycare centers, etc.) adjacent to the project site. See Response 8.a.
C.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				х	The project will not generate objectionable odors.
9.	NOISE - Would the project:					
a.	Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?		-		х	The project is not in the vicinity of any uses that generate substantial noise, nor will the completed project generate substantial noise. The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.
b.	Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			Х		Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact is less than significant due to the temporary nature of the these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).
10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would	the project:	a Kanana aya kata mata	2 Al an Low Art Arts	Longer and the	
a	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?			Х		The project will incrementally add to groundwater consumption; however, the singular and cumulative impacts of the proposed project upon the groundwater decline in the project area are minor.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			Х		The project does not involve any modifications that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern and or/increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would lead to flooding.
					Compliance with applicable requirements of the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards will ensure that impacts are less than significant.
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?				X	The project is not within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, nor is the project within a local flood hazard area.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?				х	The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain.
e. Develop in an area that is subject to 200 year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP)?				Х	The project is not located in an area subject to 200-year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP).
f. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				Х	The project will not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
g. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			Х		The project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems. Adequate on- and/or off-site drainage improvements will be required pursuant to the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance and Improvement Standards.

11

.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
h.	Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			X		Compliance with the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively) will ensure that the project will not create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality. Sacramento County Code Chapters 6.28 and 6.32 provide rules and regulations for water wells and septic systems that are designed to protect water quality. The Environmental Health Division of the County Environmental Management Department has permit approval authority for any new water wells and septic systems on the site. Compliance with existing regulations will ensure that impacts are less than significant.
11	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				and a street	
а.	Expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				Х	Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will ensure less than significant impacts.
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?				Х	Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?				X	The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit. Pursuant to Title 16 of the Sacramento County Code and the Uniform Building Code, a soils report will be required prior to building construction. If the soils report indicates than soils may be unstable for building construction then site-specific measures (e.g., special engineering design or soil replacement) must be incorporated to ensure that soil conditions will be satisfactory for the proposed construction.
d.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?			X		All septic systems must comply with the requirements of the County Environmental Management Department, Environmental Health Division, as set forth in Chapter 6.32 of the County Code. Compliance with County standards will ensure impacts are less than significant.
e.	Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?				X	The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located on the project site. Although located in an area with known mineral resources, the proposed project would not significantly impact future use of important mineral resources located on site.
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?				Х	No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.
12	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project	ti				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?		X			The project site contains suitable habitat for several special status species. The project is a covered activity in the SSHCP. As such, the project will be required to comply with the AMMS of the SSHCP and the applicant will be required to participate in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources section above.

11

•

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?		Х			The project site contains sensitive aquatic features. The project is a covered activity in the SSHCP. As such, the project will be required to comply with the AMMS of the SSHCP and the applicant will be required to participate in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources section above.
C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?		Х			The project site contains sensitive aquatic features. The project is a covered activity in the SSHCP. As such, the project will be required to comply with the AMMS of the SSHCP and the applicant will be required to participate in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources section above.
d.	Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?			Х		The project site contains modeled habitat for several special status species. The project is a covered activity in the SSHCP. As such, the project will be required to comply with the AMMS of the SSHCP and the applicant will be required to participate in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources section above.
e.	Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?				Х	No native and/or landmark trees occur on the project site, nor is it anticipated that any native and/or landmark trees would be affected by off-site improvement required as a result of the project.
f.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?				Х	The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources.
g.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?				Х	There are no known conflicts with any approved plan for the conservation of habitat. The project is within the Urban Development Area of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP). The project will need to comply with the applicable avoidance and minimization measures outlined in the SSHCP. Refer to the Biological Resources section above.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?				X	No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?				Х	No known archaeological resources occur on-site. Natural Investigations Company conducted a pedestrian-level survey of the site and prepared a cultural report for the project. Refer to the Cultural Resources section.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X	The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains. No known human remains exist on the project site. Nonetheless, mitigation has been recommended to ensure appropriate treatment should remains be uncovered during project implementation.
14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would th	e project:				
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?			Х		Notification pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1(b) was provided to the tribes and one request for consultation was received. Refer to the Cultural Resources section.
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -	Would the pr	oject:			
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?				X	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.

- 11

٠

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
			with Mitigation			
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				Х	The project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing /proposed school.
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?				Х	The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.
e.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?				Х	The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan.
f.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to or intermixed with urbanized areas?			Х		The project is within unincorporated County and is located within the Local Responsibility Area according to the CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (2007). The project site is located within Compliance with local Fire District standards and requirements ensures impacts are less than significant.
16	. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the	project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			Х		The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project. Based on the estimated annual emissions of 61.92 metric tons, the project would not exceed the county threshold of 878,275 annual metric tons of CO2e for residential energy sector.
						The project will not have the potential to interfere with the County meeting the goals of AB 32 (reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020); therefore, the climate change impact of the project is considered less than significant.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

71

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	Ag-Res (Agricultural- Residential)	Х		
Community Plan	AR-2	Х		Vineyard Community Plan
Land Use Zone	AR-2 (Agricultural- Residential – 2 acres)	X		

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Tim Hawkins Section Manager: Joelle Inman Project Manager: Emma Patten Environmental Document Author: Josh Greetan Initial Review: Josh Greetan Office Manager: Belinda Wekesa-Batts Administrative Support: Justin Maulit