## **Notice of Exemption**

To:	X	Office of Planning and Research	From: (Public Agency) Cordova Recreation & Park District 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670		
		1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 Sacramento, CA 95814			
	_		(Address)		
		County Clerk County of			
			-		
			_		
Pro	ject Titl	e: The sale of the 5 acre parcel 063-0020-013 wh	tich is currently owned by Cordova Rec & Park District.		
Pro	ject Loc	eation - Specific: The project is located at: 9361	JACKSON RD, SACRAMENTO, CA 95826		
Pro	ject Loc	eation - City: Sacramento	Project Location - County: Sacramento		
Des	cription	of Nature, Purpose, and Beneficiaries of P	roject:		
,	The Cord	ova Recreation & Park District is selling a 5-acre p	arcel that was an unused portion of the Cordova Golf Course.		
	Δ huver l	nas not yet been identified.			
	- Duyer i	as not yet been identified.			
Nan	ne of Pu	ablic Agency Approving Project:The selling	of the property was approved by the CRPD Board on 6.17.20.		
			ordova Recreation & Park District		
Exe	-	itus: (check one)			
		sterial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);			
		gency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a)); gency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));			
		gorical Exemption. State type and section number:			
		tory Exemptions. State code number:			
_			1 15312 C		
		hy project is exempt: The property is exempt:			
<del>-e</del> r	12		e property does not have significant values for wildlife habitat or other ent property has not changed since the time of purchase by the public		
Lea	ıd Agen	cv			
	ntact Pe		Area Code/Telephone/Extension: 916-842-3312		
If fi	1. Attac	pplicant: h certified document of exemption finding. Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agen	cy approving the project? X Yes \( \subseteq \) No		
Sign	nature: _	(ist) Cames 1	Date: 8/20/20 Title: Lands one Architect		
	10	(	d for filing at OPR: Governor's Office of Planning & Research		
	M	Signed by Applicant	Aug 21 2020sed October 1989		

## **CEQA Environmental Checklist**

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Sale of parcel 063-0200-013
Lead agency name and address:	Cordova Recreation & Park District, 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Contact person and phone number:	Cristina James, 916-842-3312
Project Location:	9361 JACKSON RD, SACRAMENTO, CA 95826
Project sponsor's name and address:	n/a
General plan description:	INTENSIVE INDUSTRIAL
Zoning:	M-1 (SM) - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/SURFACE MINING
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	This project includes the sale of the 5 acre property which is an unused portion of the Cordova Golf Course
Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:	The site was once home to the Old McDonald Farm restaurant. The property is covered in non-native vegetation and the remnants of the restaurant building.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	n/a
Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?	No.
Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.	

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry	П	Air Quality		
+	Biological Resources	H	Cultural Resources	H	Energy		
H	Geology/Soils	H	Greenhouse Gas	+	Hazards and Hazardous		
	Geology/Solls		Emissions	L_J	Materials		
	Hydrology/Water	$\Box$	Land Use/Planning	$\Box$	Mineral Resources		
	Quality		Land Ose/Plaining	ш	Willieral Resources		
	Noise		Population/Housing	П	Public Services		
#	Recreation	H	Transportation	<u> </u>	Tribal Cultural Resources		
H-	Utilities/Service		Wildfire	<del>H</del> -			
لــا			vviidiire	Ш	Mandatory Findings of		
	Systems				Significance		
	RMINATION: e basis of this initial evalua						
x	I find that the proposed page NEGATIVE DECLARA		COULD NOT have a significa will be prepared.	nt effe	ect on the environment, and		
			d project could have a signific	ant ef	fect on the environment,		
			fect in this case because revis				
			oject proponent. A MITIGATE				
	will be prepared.	·					
	I find that the proposed p	roject	MAY have a significant effect	on the	e environment, and an		
	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPA				,		
			MAY have a "potentially signif	icant	impact" or "potentially		
	significant unless mitigate	eď" im	pact on the environment, but a	at leas	t one effect 1) has been		
	adequately analyzed in a	n earl	er document pursuant to appl	icable	legal standards, and 2)		
	has been addressed by r	nitigat	ion measures based on the ea	ırlier a	nalysis as described on		
			MENTAL IMPACT REPORT is	s requ	ired, but it must analyze		
	only the effects that rema						
	I find that although the pr	opose	ed project could have a signific	ant ef	fect on the environment,		
	because all potentially sign	gnifica	nt effects (a) have been analy	zed a	dequately in an earlier EIR		
	or NEGATIVE DECLARA	TION	pursuant to applicable standa	rds, a	nd (b) have been avoided		
			arlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECL				
	mitigation measures that	are in	posed upon the proposed pro	ject, r	nothing further is required.		
	4		-				
Cierr	atura Cid A.	1 a a A			Date: 3 /24/26		
Sign	ature:	mos			Date: 8/20/20		
Prin	Printed Name: (NISTINIA Table 1) For: (RPD)						

CEQA Environmental Checklist		
DistCoRte.	P.M/P.M.	E.A.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resor	urces Code	Section 2109	99, would the	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance quality management district or air pollution control district following determinations. Would the project:				air
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?				X
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				×
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?		·		X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X
VI. ENERGY: Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
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, liquefaction or collapse?				<b>_3</b>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the	project:			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				x
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Wo	ould the proje	ect:		
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the	e project:			
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X

*	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:		Mitigation		
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				ď
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;				X
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t		
XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				Ø		
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				Ø		
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project	ect:					
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				ß		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X		
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
Fire protection?				Z.		
Police protection?				X		
Schools?				X		
Parks?				X		
Other public facilities?				X		

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
XVI. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				×
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				ď
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscathe size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, o Native American tribe, and that is:	e, defined in ape that is g	Public Reso eographically	urces Code : y defined in t	section erms of
a) 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				X
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				X
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would to	he project:			
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

	Potentiall y Significa nt Impact	Less Than Significa nt with Mitigation	Less Than Significa nt Impact	No Impac t
XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibi hazard severity zones, would the project:	lity areas or I	ands classifi	ied as very h	igh fire
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				×
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				☒
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				Ø
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X