

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: PLER2020-00013

Title and Short Description of Project: Kiefer Landfill Wastewater Force Main Project

The Kiefer Landfill Wastewater Force Main Project consists of a 2.6 mile long, six inch diameter force main transmission pipeline and pumping system, which connects to the 250,000-gallon leachate storage tank at the Kiefer Landfill . The pipeline will travel west within a subsurface trench approximately 18 inches wide and three to four feet deep, within the right-of-way of Kiefer Boulevard and will terminate at the SASD pump station S138 in the City of Rancho Cordova¹. The construction schedule for the proposed project is approximately six (6) months. The design of the pipeline and pump station is based on existing leachate generation and estimates of future leachate generation. A flow rate of 40,000 gallons per day (gpd) was used as a design average flow with a peak rate of 100,000 gpd during periods of high leachate generation.

Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil will be exhumed in the trenching process. If the soil is of suitable quality, it will be utilized as backfill; otherwise, the soil will be disposed of at Kiefer Landfill. If the soil is disposed of, approximately 2,400 cubic yards of gravel will be used as backfill. Construction methods vary depending on the location along the pipeline and include open cut trench and horizontal directional drilling techniques. Where feasible, construction will avoid impacts to the wetland areas. The projected construction timeframe is six months during daytime hours only. The contractor staging area will be located within the alignment and at the Kiefer Landfill.

- 3. Assessor's Parcel Number: Kiefer Landfill APN:126-0090-021 SASD pump station S138 APN:067-0670-082
- 4. Location of Project: The Project is a linear location from the Kiefer Landfill to a pump station in the City of Rancho Cordova adjacent to an Anatolia subdivision Project alignment begins at the pump station adjacent to the 250,000-gallon leachate storage tank at the Kiefer Landfill located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard, Sloughhouse, CA 95683. Pipeline runs 2.6 miles west, along the south side of Kiefer Boulevard between the Kiefer Landfill entrance and Grant Line Road, along the north side of Kiefer Boulevard from Grant Line Road to the bridge crossing over Laguna Creek at Blodgett Reservoir. From the bridge crossing, the pipeline may run on either side of Kiefer Boulevard to Rancho Cordova Parkway. From Rancho Cordova Parkway, the pipeline runs along the south side of Kiefer Boulevard to Country Garden Drive. The pipeline will then cross beneath Country Garden Drive and terminate to the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) S138 pump station located at 11922 Elk View Way on northwest corner of Kiefer Boulevard and Country Garden Drive within the City of Rancho Cordova
- 5. Project Applicant: Sacramento County Department of Waste Management & Recycling
- 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 Office of County Planning and Environmental Review in support of this Negative Declaration. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Office Planning and Environmental Review at 827 Seventh Street, Room 225, Sacramento, California, 95814, or phone (916) 874-6141.

[Original Signature on File] Todd Smith Interim Environmental Coordinator County of Sacramento, State of California

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT INFORMATION

CONTROL NUMBER: PLER2020-00013

NAME: Kiefer Landfill Wastewater Force Main Project

LOCATION: The Project is a linear location from the Kiefer Landfill to a pump station in the City of Rancho Cordova adjacent to an Anatolia subdivision (Plate IS-1). Project alignment begins at the pump station adjacent to the 250,000-gallon leachate storage tank at the Kiefer Landfill located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard, Sloughhouse, CA 95683 (Plate IS-2). Pipeline runs 2.6 miles west, along the south side of Kiefer Boulevard between the Kiefer Landfill entrance and Grant Line Road, along the north side of Kiefer Boulevard from Grant Line Road to the bridge crossing over Laguna Creek at Blodgett Reservoir. From the bridge crossing, the pipeline may run on either side of Kiefer Boulevard to Rancho Cordova Parkway. From Rancho Cordova Parkway, the pipeline runs along the south side of Kiefer Boulevard to Country Garden Drive. The pipeline will then cross beneath Country Garden Drive and terminate to the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) S138 pump station located at 11922 Elk View Way on northwest corner of Kiefer Boulevard and Country Garden Drive within the City of Rancho Cordova (Plate IS-3).

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): The pipeline runs adjacent or within the public right-of-way along various parcels.

- Kiefer Landfill APN:126-0090-021
- SASD pump station S138 APN:067-0670-082

APPLICANT:

Sacramento County Department of Waste Management & Recycling

10863 Gold Center Drive

Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Attn: Rachel Davis



Plate IS-1 Regional Location

Plate IS-2 Leachate Tank Location





Plate IS-3 Proposed Force Main Alignment

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Kiefer Landfill Wastewater Force Main Project consists of a 2.6 mile long, six inch diameter force main transmission pipeline and pumping system, which connects to the 250,000-gallon leachate storage tank at the Kiefer Landfill (Plate IS-2). The pipeline will travel west within a subsurface trench approximately 18 inches wide and three to four feet deep, within the right-of-way of Kiefer Boulevard and will terminate at the SASD pump station S138 in the City of Rancho Cordova¹ (Plate IS-4). The construction schedule for the proposed project is approximately six (6) months.

The design of the pipeline and pump station is based on existing leachate generation and estimates of future leachate generation. A flow rate of 40,000 gallons per day (gpd) was used as a design average flow with a peak rate of 100,000 gpd during periods of high leachate generation.

Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil will be exhumed in the trenching process. If the soil is of suitable quality, it will be utilized as backfill; otherwise, the soil will be disposed of at Kiefer Landfill. If the soil is disposed of, approximately 2,400 cubic yards of gravel will be used as backfill. Construction methods vary depending on the location along the pipeline and include open cut trench and horizontal directional drilling techniques. Where feasible, construction will avoid impacts to the wetland areas. The projected construction timeframe is six months during daytime hours only. The contractor staging area will be located within the alignment and at the Kiefer Landfill.

CONSTRUCTION METHODS

Horizontal directional drilling or jack and bore will be the construction method to cross underneath five locations: Kiefer Landfill facility entrance (Plate IS-5), Grant Line Road (Plate IS-6), Laguna Creek at Blodgett Reservoir (Plate IS-7), the box culvert (BC1)(Plate IS-8), and Kiefer Boulevard to the S138 pump station at Country Garden Drive (Plate IS-8). Horizontal drilling may be used around other waters and wetland areas to avoid impacts. Open trenching will also be used along the alignment where feasible.

¹ Landfill leachate is a liquid, primarily rainwater, which infiltrates and percolates through degrading waste. Leachate generates when landfill refuse material becomes saturated and portions of the decomposing material leach into the water and collect at the base of the landfill. The extent of leachate generation is dependent on many factors including: (1) availability of water, (2) landfill surface conditions, (3) refuse conditions, and (4) underlying soil conditions.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project alignment along Kiefer Boulevard crosses undulating topography within the unincorporated County of Sacramento (Cosumnes community) and the City of Rancho Cordova. The alignment features a steady elevation drop (about 80 feet over the 13,000 feet), except near the Blodgett Reservoir where there is a 3.5% grade drop followed by a 7.2% rise (Plate IS-9). Elevations within the project area range from approximately 135 to 220 feet above mean sea level. The proposed discharge point of the force main is at the SASD owned 48" manhole upstream of the pump station (just outside the east wall), with an invert of 117.92 feet (Plate IS-10).

Kiefer Boulevard is a two-lane roadway with sloped shoulders and roadside ditches. The length of the Kiefer Boulevard right-of-way includes sections of paved road, unpaved shoulder, graveled road and dirt road (Plate IS-11).

Land uses along the section of Kiefer Boulevard from the Kiefer Landfill to Rancho Cordova Parkway are agricultural and open space in nature. Surrounding lands contain habitat for a variety of biological resources. Ruderal vegetation occurs along the shoulders and margins of the paved and unpaved sections of Kiefer Boulevard. The project crosses Laguna Creek. It is worth noting that there are two Laguna Creeks in the County; this is the smaller less well known Laguna Creek. Seasonal wetland vegetation occurs on the banks of Laguna Creek and on the dirt section of Kiefer Boulevard where ephemeral drainages and pools cross into the unpaved right-of-way. Perennial wetland vegetation occurs in and along the banks of the channel below the culvert outlet south of Kiefer Boulevard.

Land uses change to urban (without any transition) west of Rancho Cordova Parkway, along Kiefer Boulevard to the SASD pump station on the corner of Country Garden Drive and Elk View Way in the City of Rancho Cordova.

The project alignment is located within the boundaries of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP). The pipeline begins within the SSHCP plan area at the Kiefer Landfill and transitions into the Urban Development Area (UDA) within the boundaries of the City of Rancho Cordova as the pipeline moves west. The SSHCP land cover types along the pipeline consist primarily of valley grassland, seasonal wetlands, vernal pool and swale (Plate IS-12).



Plate IS-4 Leachate Force Main Overall and Key Plan



Plate IS-5 Kiefer Landfill Facility Entrance

Plate IS-6 Grant Line Road





Plate IS-7 Laguna Creek at Blodgett Reservoir



Plate IS-8 Kiefer Boulevard to S138 Pump Station at Country Garden Drive



Plate IS-9 Proposed Force Main Alignment with Ground Elevation



Plate IS-10 Discharge to Pump Station



Plate IS-11 Unimproved Kiefer Boulevard





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.

BACKGROUND

Currently, Sacramento County Department of Waste Management and Recycling (DWMR) is disposing approximately 25,000 gallons of leachate daily from the Kiefer Landfill to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. The leachate is hauled by truck approximately 20 miles.

DWMR anticipates adding lined modules to the Kiefer Landfill for many decades. As each module is added to the facility, the quantity of leachate and condensate will continue to increase. As a result, DWMR prepared the *Kiefer Landfill Lechate Alternatives Study Report* (Appendix A) to evaluate alternatives that addressed both existing deficiencies with leachate management as well as long-term solutions. The pipeline is the preferred alternative as it provides a long-term solution for the disposal of leachate generated at Kiefer Landfill.

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San) and Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) have established a wastewater service contract and operating agreement with DWMR to establish a connection for leachate disposal at Pump Station (S138).



Plate IS-13 Pump Configuration at Kiefer Landfill



Plate IS-14 Location of Storage Tank Pump Skid Access and Staging

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?

REGULATORY SETTING

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. Project related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation (Table IS-1). 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). The current analysis utilizes the current SMAQMD standards as outlined below.

Pollutant	Attainment with State Standards	Attainment with Federal Standards
Ozone	Non-Attainment (1 hour Standard ¹ and 8 hour standard)	Attainment (1 hour standard ²) Non-Attainment, Classification = Severe -15* (8 hour ³ Standards)
Particulate Matter 10 Micron	Non-Attainment (24 hour Standard and Annual Mean)	Attainment (24 hour standard)
Particulate Matter 2.5 Micron	Attainment (Annual Standard)	Non-Attainment (24 hour Standard) and 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/unclassifiable ⁵ (1 hour Standard)
Lead	Attainment (30 Day Standard)	Attainment (3-month rolling average)
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified (8 hour Standard)	No Federal Standard

Table IS-1: Air Quality Stan	dards Attainment Status
------------------------------	-------------------------

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.

3. For the 1997, 2008 and the 2015 Standard.

4. Cannot be classified

5. Designation was made as part of EPA's designations for the 2010 SO₂ Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard – Round 3 Designation in December 2017

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

Source: SMAQMD. "Air Quality Pollutants and Standards". Web. Accessed: March 14,2019. http://airquality.org/air-quality-health/air-quality-pollutants-and-standards

Table IS-2 SMAQMD Significance Thresholds

	ROG ¹	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM2.5	
	(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*}	
 Reactive Organic Gas California Ambient Air Quality Standards 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 O bs/day. 						

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS/SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

Short-term air quality impacts are mostly due to dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) generated by construction and development activities, and emissions from equipment and vehicle engines (NO_x) 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 PM_{2.5} are considered unhealthy because the particles are small enough to inhale and damage lung tissue, which can lead to respiratory problems.

The project involves trenching activities for installation of a new pipeline. Therefore, the project does not meet the screening criteria for PM emissions and further analysis must be conducted. The SMAQMD Road Emissions Model was utilized in order to estimate emissions during the construction of the proposed pipeline. The model utilizes construction equipment, phasing and timelines to generate daily emissions estimate and operational emissions for a project. The model utilizes equipment, phasing and timelines to generate daily emissions estimate. For modeling purposes, maximum numbers of equipment were used, and it was assumed all equipment could operate simultaneously. This represents a conservative estimate to equipment and timelines that demonstrates a 'worst case scenario' in terms of potential emissions. The results are summarized in Table IS-3 below.

The total project area is six acres and the maximum area to be disturbed on a daily basis is 0.5 acres. The project will involve open trenching activities for the majority of the pipeline. Horizontal directional drilling will be utilized to avoid wetlands and construct underneath roads. Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil will be exhumed in the trenching process and will be disposed of at Kiefer Landfill. The size of the truck hauling the soil to the Kiefer Landfill will be 8 cubic yards in size.

Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of gravel will be trucked in from a rock yard located 10 miles from the project site. Gravel will be unloaded in locations selected by the contractor where the material can be readily used along the path of the pipeline. Typically, the soil would be placed back into the trench as backfill and not hauled offsite. However, until the quality of the subsurface soils and the appropriateness of the soil to be used as backfill material in the trench, the CEQA analysis will proceed with the worst case assumption. If the geotechnical evaluation determines that the soil is suitable, then the 2,400 cubic yards of gravel will not be needed.

According to the applicant, two crews will be working on the pipeline simultaneously (one crew at each end). Therefore, construction equipment was doubled within the SMAQMD Road Emissions Model and results are summarized in Table IS-3 below.

OPERATIONAL IMPACTS

Operationally, this project will have no impacts on air quality. Electricity will be required to operate the new pump station at the Kiefer Landfill. However, when compared to the current practice of trucking the leachate 20 miles to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, operation of the pump station and pipeline will reduce impacts on air quality.

PARTICULATE MATTER 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 PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ 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)].

OZONE PRECURSOR EMISSIONS (NOx)

The screening criteria for construction-related ozone precursor emissions (NO_x) are the same as those listed for particulate matter. The project does not meet the screening criteria above due to the trenching activities. As shown in the modeling results in Table IS-3 below, the project will not exceed the NO_x significance threshold. Air quality impacts associated with the construction of the project are *less than significant*.

Construction Year	Constituent in pounds per day					
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}		
2021	5.16	40.24	11.52	3.44		
Threshold Exceeded	n/a	No	No	No		

 Table IS-3: Road Emissions Model Results-Construction Phase

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS CONCLUSION

As shown in the above table (Table IS-3), the project will not exceed the SMAQMD construction significance thresholds for NOx, PM10 or PM2.5. It is likely the 2,400 cubic yards of soil will be suitable to place back into the trench as backfill and not be hauled to the Kiefer Landfill for disposal. If this is the case, the numbers in (Table IS-3) will be significantly reduced as emissions will not be created from transporting soil to the landfill and importing gravel from a local supplier. Therefore, impacts associated with emissions for air quality standards are *less than significant*.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

• Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?

WATER QUALITY

OPERATIONAL WATER QUALITY

The project is necessary to remove and treat landfill leachate, which could affect surface and ground water if left untreated. The completed project will for the leachate pipeline is not expected to have negative impacts to water quality. Operational impacts of the proposed project to water quality are less than significant.

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 public projects in the County, regardless of size or land use type.

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. 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.

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*.

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.

REGULATORY **S**ETTING AND **M**ETHODOLOGY

Discussed within this section are species and habitats afforded special recognition by federal, state, or local resource conservation agencies and organizations.

Special status species include:

- Species that are listed or proposed for listing as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered under the state or federal Endangered Species Acts;
- Species that meet the definitions for rare or endangered under CEQA;
- Animals listed as Species of Special Concern by the CDFW;
- Animal species which are Fully Protected in California;
- Plant taxa listed by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS); and
- Plants listed under the California Native Plant Protection Act.

SURVEYS AND METHODOLOGY

The methodologies used to determine significance rely on documents published by or endorsed by regulatory agencies. Surveys and studies performed on the Project site have been conducted by qualified professionals. The applicable documents and methods are cited and described in the impact discussions below. 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:

- Wetland Delineation (Appendix B)
- SSHCP

SURVEYS AND STUDIES

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 throughout this chapter. Species considered for presence are those species with

modeled habitat identified in the SSHCP and species considered to be potentially present as indicated on the official USFWS species list and CNDDB quad list, and are the basis for species outlined in (Table IS-4). Recorded species occurrences adjacent to the proposed pipeline according to CNDDB database (Plate IS-15). Habitat and vegetation types within the linear boundaries of the proposed project (Plate IS-16). According to the Wetland Delineation (Appendix B), the plants observed within the study area are Ruderal Species and no vernal pool-associated special-status plant species were recorded within the study area.

Likelihood of occurrence is rated as Not Present, Low Potential, Moderate Potential, High Potential, or Present, which are defined as:

Not Present: A survey was performed by a qualified biologist, and the species was not found and habitat is absent both on the site and within one mile of the site.

Low Potential: Habitat is near-absent.

Moderate Potential: Habitat is present, but the species has not been observed within five miles of the site.

High Potential: Habitat is present and the species has been observed within five miles of the site.

Present: The CNDDB contains a recorded occurrence on the site, or the species was found during site-specific surveys.

Species which are not present or were found to have a low potential of occurrence are not discussed further in subsequent analysis sections.

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence	Potential for Impact
		BIRDS		
Burrowing Owl Athene cunicularia hypugea	CSC SSHCP	Frequents open grasslands and shrublands with perches and burrows. Nests and roosts in old burrows of small mammals and rubble piles. Listed for breeding habitat.	High. Suitable foraging habitat present. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Burrowing Owl have been located approximately 0.35 miles northeast from the proposed pipeline route.	Nesting and or foraging habitat may be impacted during construction of pipeline.
Swainson's Hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	ST SSHCP	Breeds in stands with few trees in juniper- sage flats, riparian areas, and oak savannah. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands or grain fields supporting rodent populations.	High: Suitable foraging habitat present. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Swainson's Hawk have been located approximately 1.41 miles southeast from the proposed pipeline route.	Nesting and or foraging habitat may be impacted during construction of pipeline.
Tricolored Blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	CSC SSHCP	The species is listed for breeding habitat. Known to nest near marshes in large (several hundred to several thousand birds) breeding colonies in habitat made up of blackberry thickets, bulrush (<i>Scrirpus</i> sp.) or cattails (<i>Typha</i> sp.) patches.	High: Suitable foraging habitat present. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Tricolored Blackbird have been located approximately 1.41 miles southeast from the proposed pipeline route.	Nesting and or foraging habitat may be impacted during construction of pipeline.
White-Tailed Kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	CFP, SA SSHCP	Inhabit low-elevation grasslands, wetlands dominated by grasses, oak woodlands, and agricultural and riparian areas. The species is listed for nesting.	High. Suitable foraging and nesting habitat present within Project area. According to CNDDB data occurrences While-Tailed Kite have been located 200 feet south of the proposed pipeline route.	Nesting and or foraging habitat may be impacted during construction of pipeline.

Table IS-4: Special Status Species Likelihood for Occurrence

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence	Potential for Impact
		MAMMALS		
American Badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	CSC SSHCP	Occurs in a variety of habitats, including grasslands and oak woodlands. Requires loose or easily crumbled soils for digging.	Low. According to CNDDB data occurrences of American Badger have been located 1.43 miles northwest from the proposed pipeline route. However, the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
		AMPHIBIANS		
California Tiger Salamander <i>Ambystoma</i> <i>californiense</i>	FT ST SSHCP	Endemic to annual grasslands and valley- foothill habitats in California. Adults spend most time in subterranean refugia, particularly in ground squirrel burrows. Seasonal ponds or vernal pools are required for breeding.	Low Potential. No occurrences within the project area according to the CNDDB data.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
Western Spadefoot Toad <i>Scaphiopus</i> (Spea) hammondii	CSC SSHCP	Occurs primarily in grasslands but occasionally populates valley-foothill hardwood woodlands. Almost entirely terrestrial, but requires temporary rain pools that lack predators (fish, bullfrogs, crayfish) for breeding. Also needs burrows for refuge.	High. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Western Spadefoot Toad have been recorded approximately 0.37 miles north of the proposed pipeline.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
		INVERTEBRATES	•	
California Linderiella <i>Linderiella</i> occidentalis	SA	A fairy shrimp which most often occupies pools that are vegetated and contain clear water. Not uncommon to observe the species in mud-bottomed pools with slightly turbid water. ²	Low.According to CNDDB data occurrences of California Linderiella have been recorded approximately 0.63 miles south of the proposed pipeline. However, the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence	Potential for Impact
Midvalley Fairy Shrimp Branchinecta mesovallensis	SA SSHCP	Inhabit shallow vernal pools, vernal swales, and various artificial ephemeral wetland habitats in the Sacramento, Solano, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Madera, Merced, and Fresno Counties. ²	Low. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Midvalley Fairy Shrimp have been recorded approximately 1.70 miles southwest of the proposed pipeline. However, the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
Ricksecker's Water Scavenger Beetle <i>Hydrochara</i> <i>rickseckeri</i>	SA SSHCP	The species is an aquatic beetle dependent upon wetland habitats. ² Based on CNDDB records, the species has been observed at Mather Field.	Low potential. According to CNDDB data, no occurrences have been recorded within the project area.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp Branchinecta Iynchi	FT SSHCP	Inhabit alkaline pools, ephemeral drainages, rock outcrop pools, ditches, stream oxbows, stockponds, vernal pools, vernal swales, and other seasonal wetlands. Also found in basalt flow depression pools in unplowed grasslands. ²	Low. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp have been recorded approximately 0.26 miles north of the proposed pipeline. However, the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.
Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp <i>Lepidurus</i> <i>packardi</i>	FE SSHCP	Inhabits small to large vernal pools containing clear to highly turbid water. ²	Low. According to CNDDB data occurrences of Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp have been recorded approximately 400 feet south of the proposed pipeline. However, the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.	Low potential as the plant species observed within the study area do not support the species.

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence	Potential for Impact
Ahart's Dwarf Rush <i>Juncus</i> <i>leiospermus var.</i> ahartii	List 1B SSHCP	Valley and foothill grassland/mesic; elevation 100 – 330 ft (blooms Mar. – May)	Low: According to CNDDB data occurrences of Ahart's Dwarf Rush have been recorded approximately 0.29 miles west of the proposed pipeline. However, this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation	No potential as this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation.
Boggs Lake Hedge-Hyssop <i>Gratiola</i> <i>heterosepala</i>	SE, List 1B SSHCP	Marshes and swamps, vernal pools/clay; elevation 30 – 7,790 ft (blooms Apr. – Aug.)	Low: According to CNDDB data occurrences of Boggs Lake Hedge-Hyssop have been recorded approximately 0.35 miles northeast of the proposed pipeline. However, this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation	No potential as this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation.
Legenere Legenere limosa	List 1B SSHCP	Vernal pools; elevation 0 – 2,900 ft (blooms Apr. – Jun.)	Low: According to CNDDB data occurrences of Legenere have been recorded approximately 1.13 miles southwest of the proposed pipeline. However, this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation	No potential as this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation.

Species	Status ¹	Habitat ¹	Potential for Occurrence	Potential for Impact
Sacramento Orcutt Grass <i>Orcuttia viscida</i>	FE, SE, List 1B SSHCP	Vernal pools; elevation 100 – 330 ft (blooms Apr. – Jul.)	Low: According to CNDDB data occurrences of Sacramento Orcutt Grass have been recorded approximately 250 feet north of the proposed pipeline. However, this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation	No potential as this plant was not observed in the study area according to the wetland delineation.

elevant species compiled from the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Data Base (2011) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Species List for Sacramento County

1. Listing status sources and, unless otherwise specified, habitat description sources (life history accounts) are:

California Species: <u>http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/list.html</u> for the general webpage where you can use the links, or use the "search" field in the upper right-hand corner – for instance, enter "American Badger life history" – to obtain life history accounts. Most Bird Accounts are <u>www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/ssc/birds.html</u>, most Mammal Accounts are <u>http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/publications/bm_research/docs/86_27.pdf</u> and <u>http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/ssc/1998mssc.html</u>, most Fish Accounts are <u>http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/info/fish_ssc.pdf</u>, and most reptile and amphibian accounts are <u>http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/publications/docs/herp_ssc.pdf</u>. Last accessed May, 2018.

Federal Species: http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/ES_Species/Accounts/Home/es_species.htm Last accessed May, 2018.

California Native Plant Society: <u>http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/</u> Last accessed May, 2018.

2. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, "Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon", December 2005.

FE = Federal Endangered; FT = Federal Threatened; FC = Federal Candidate

SE = State of California Endangered; ST = State of California Threatened; CSC = State of California Species of Special Concern; CFP = State of California Fully Protected; SA = Special Animal

SSHCP = Species covered by the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan

List 1B = California Native Plant Society Endangered, Threatened, or Rare in California

List 2 = California Native Plant Society Endangered, Threatened, or Rare in California but more common elsewhere



Plate IS-15 CNDDB Map

Plate IS-16 Habitat and Vegetation



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 includes U.S. Highway 50 to the north, the Sacramento River levee and County Road J11 (connects the towns of Walnut Grove and Thornton, it is 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 project is considered a covered activity, although a portion of the alignment is outside the Urban Development Area (UDA). That portion outside the UDA is within a rural road, which is a SSHCP covered activity. In addition, the construction of wastewater facilities are SSHCP covered activities as well as construction, operation and maintenance of groundwater treatment facilities at Kiefer Landfill.

The Project must comply with the provisions of the SSHCP and associated permits. The analysis contained below addresses the applicability of the SSHCP, and mitigation has been designed to comply with the SSHCP.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN

The proposed project's design and construction must comply with all SSHCP requirements including SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs) (Appendix C).

Temporary effects alter a land cover or species habitat for less than 1 year, and the disturbed area recovers or is restored to pre-project habitat conditions within 1 year of completing the ground disturbance. Permanent effects analyzed include (1) effects from Covered Activities that have a duration exceeding 1 year, and (2) effects from ground-disturbing Covered Activities with a duration of less than 1 year but the disturbed land cover or species modeled habitat require more than 1 year to restore to pre-activity condition (restoration begins immediately following end of the ground disturbance).

Covered Activity crossings of new roads, bike or pedestrian trails, railroads, sewer lines, water lines, recycled water lines, or utility lines are allowed in SSHCP Stream Setbacks as long as they cross perpendicular to the stream. Crossing must be stabilized to prevent potential erosion due to its use as a crossing.

The SSHCP is a habitat based plan in which mitigation fees are based primarily on impacts to habitat or land cover rather than impacts to individual species.

The baseline mapping for the SSHCP Landcovers is illustrated in (Plate IS-12). The landcovers outlined in the baseline map are an interpretation of habitat based on remote sensing analysis over a number years prior to adoption of the SSHCP. Therefore, these landcovers are intended to serve as a guide as to what may be present on the project site and are intended to be updated.

These landcovers will be refined, and calculation of project mitigation impact fees will be based on the additional survey and wetland delineation data. 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 project will comply with the requirements of the SSHCP, including adherence to the Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix C), 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 SSHCP. Impacts associated with SSHCP consistency are *less than significant*.

WETLANDS AND WATERS OF THE U.S.

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 aboveground either 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 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.

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. Mitigation requirements consistent with the SSHCP are in compliance with these policies.

The SSHCP implements a CWA Section 404 permit strategy (SPK-1995-00386) for SSHCP covered activity projects which would discharge fill material into wetlands and other waters of the United States. The multi-tiered CWA 404 permit strategy draws upon the content of the SSHCP, the Aquatic Resources Program (ARP), and aquatic resource protection ordinances. The ARP is a local jurisdiction based aquatic resources permit program that adds to the strength of the SSHCP framework of protection of natural communities and native plant and wildlife species, including protection of aquatic resources. A primary goal of ARP implementation is to achieve an overall no net loss of aquatic resources functions and services. While the ARP focuses on a permit program to address impacts to aquatic resources and the SSHCP focuses on permitting related to incidental take of species, both permitting processes are done in conjunction with one another and consist of:

- A programmatic general permit (PGP), founded on a local aquatic resources protection program and designed to reduce duplication with that program, for covered activities with minimal individual and cumulative effects on aquatic resources. The PGP is implemented by the three land-use authority Permit Applicants (i.e., Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova).
- A regional general permit (RGP), for covered activities with minimal individual and cumulative effects on aquatic resources that do not qualify for the PGP.
- A procedure for issuing Letters of Permission (LOP procedure) for covered activities with more than minimal effects, but less-than-significant effects, on the human environment, including aquatic resources.
- An abbreviated process for issuing standard permits (abbreviated SP) for other covered activity impacts that do not qualify for the PGP or the LOP procedure. The abbreviated SP process is used for the small number of SSHCP covered activities requiring authorization under CWA 404 that may significantly affect the human environment under NEPA, requiring the preparation of an EIS.

The CWA 404 permit strategy relies, at all levels of permitting, on the SSHCP to address avoidance, minimization and requirements for compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic resources. Key to satisfying compensatory mitigation requirements, payment of SSHCP-required fees dually fulfills a Corps-approved South Sacramento In Lieu Fee (ILF) Program established by the SSHCP Permittees, which relies on the compensatory mitigation ratio requirements for aquatic ILF resources contained in the SSHCP (vs. project-by-project compensatory mitigation evaluation).

WETLANDS AND WATERS IMPACTS ON-SITE

Typically wetland acres are jurisdictional if hydrological connectivity to a navigable waterway can be confirmed. However, interpretation of the 2020 USACE/EPA Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) excludes culverts, even if they connect to jurisdictional tributaries. A wetland delineation was prepared for the Project site by AECOM in August 2020 (Appendix B). The project study area contains approximately 0.047 acres of potentially jurisdictional features (Waters of the U.S.) and 0.639 acres of potentially non-jurisdictional features (Ephemeral Drainage) as summarized in Table IS-5.

Potentially Jurisdictional Features					
Water Type	Acres				
Intermittent Drainage (ID1) Laguna Creek	0.033				
Perennial Drainage (PD1)	0.014				
Potentially Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.	0.047				
Potentially Non-Jurisdictional Features					
Water Type	Acres				
Box Culvert (BC1)	0.023				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED1)	0.003				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED2)	0.073				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED3)	0.098				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED4)	0.032				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED5)	0.038				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED6)	0.372				
Total Ephemeral Drainage	0.639				

Table IS-5: Summary of Onsite Impacts to Waters

The 0.047 acres of potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States (Table IS-5) occurs in the form of two tributaries: one unnamed perennial drainage (PD1) and one intermittent drainage, Laguna Creek (ID1). The unnamed perennial drainage (PD1) is located at the western end of the study area (Plate IS-17). This feature is the only perennial aquatic resource that corresponds with the jurisdictional categories of waters described in the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) as waters of the United States. Perennial Drainage (PD1) accounts for approximately 0.014 acres (Plate IS-17). This drainage appears to convey water all year due to surface runoff from the

residential development to the north, and it receives seasonal runoff from an ephemeral drainage in the field to the east that crosses under Rancho Cordova Parkway via a culvert and then enters a manmade swale that parallels the north side of Kiefer Boulevard until it drains into the unnamed drainage on the north side of the culvert.

Six ephemeral drainages and a box culvert are located within the project area. When combined, there are a total of 0.639 acres of potentially non-jurisdictional wetlands and are classified as Box Culvert (BC1) and ED1 through ED6 (Table IS-5). Box Culvert (BC1) is a large cement box culvert under Kiefer Boulevard at the west end of the project area. ED1 is approximately 0.003 acres and crosses under Kiefer Boulevard between the Kiefer Landfill and Grant Line Road via a 36-inch culvert (Plate IS-18). ED2 is approximately 0.073 acres and crosses the dirt surface of Kiefer Boulevard approximately 0.25 miles east of the bridge over Laguna Creek (Plate IS-19). ED3 (0.098 acres), ED4 (0.032 acres) and ED5 (0.038 acres) originate along the north side of Kiefer Boulevard in pools, swales and depressions that fill with water from precipitation and then flow onto and across the road. These ephemeral drainages flow north, across the dirt road surface and flow into another ephemeral drainage that flows west towards and under Rancho Cordova Parkway and eventually into PD1. ED6 is approximately 0.372 and is a manmade stormwater swale that parallels the south of Kiefer Boulevard (Plate IS-17). ED6 transports runoff from the fields to the south, from a culvert that crosses under Kiefer Boulevard from north to south, and from the roadway itself during precipitation events. The runoff is transported west and into PD1 below the culvert outlet that crosses under Kiefer Boulevard.

The wetland delineation has been submitted to the Corps for verification. All wetland landcover types are subject to permitting through the SSHCP regardless of Corps jurisdictional determination. It may be important still to determine the extent of Corps jurisdiction as it may affect the acres of mitigation that are required to be transferred to the ILF program. Some features, such as the ephemeral drainages may be considered dry swales under the SSHCP and would be mitigated as a swale. Wetted swales may be considered to be jurisdictional features that are mitigated through the ILF program as a vernal pool. There is a substantial cost difference in the SSHCP mitigation fees between swales and vernal pools. SSHCP landcover types will be verified prior to ground disturbance.

The project alignment crosses ephemeral drainages delineated with the ROW of the unpaved portion of Kiefer Boulevard. These drainages are highly degraded by four-wheel drive traffic. The delineated ephemeral drainages are not expected to provide habitat for vernal pool species, and no vernal pool plant species were observed within

the ROW. These ephemeral drainages may be hydrologically connected to better habitat outside the project limits, as appears to be the case from aerial photography.

If the project pipe is installed using open trenching through the ephemeral drainage, the underlying clay layer could be broken, depending on the depth of the clay layer and the depth of the trench. If the open trench rips through the clay layer, the hydrologically connected off site water features may be impacted, as the water would be able to drain rather than being perched above the hard pan. Boring waters and wetlands would likely avoid this impact. It may also be possible to avoid the impact if the trench is shallow and does not rip through the clay layer. The depth of the trench or the clay layer has not been determined.

If the depth of the hardpan is shallow, the project will likely include boring beneath the hardpan to install the pipe. If the depth of the hardpan is below the depth of the trench, the pipe may be installed using the open trench method followed by replacement of the topsoil. The pipeline route will avoid the Ephemeral Drainage (ED6) as the route is located north of this area (Plate IS-17).

Laguna Creek (ID1) is an intermittent drainage that flows into Blodgett Reservoir at or near the bridge over Kiefer Boulevard and is the only intermittent aquatic resource that corresponds with the jurisdictional categories of waters considered "waters of the United States" (Table IS-5). Within the limits of the OHWM, the section of ID1 from slightly upstream of the bridge over Kiefer Boulevard to the southern extent of the bridge, accounts for approximately 0.033 acres (Plate IS-18). Downstream of the study area, Laguna Creek (ID1) enters Blodgett Reservoir. The outlet or spillway on the reservoir is approximately 0.5 miles downstream of the bridge, and Laguna Creek becomes a perennial stream below the spillway due to water from the reservoir, from other tributaries such as PD1, and from ephemeral drainages and potentially groundwater inputs within the watershed. According to (Plate IS-7), horizontal drilling under Blodgett's Reservoir will be the construction method used and ID1 will not be impacted.

WETLANDS AND WATERS OF THE U.S. CONCLUSION

As a covered activity under the SSHCP, the Project would be subject to the mitigation and permitting procedures as outlined in the SSHCP. Within the project boundary, there are approximately 0.047 acres of potentially jurisdictional features and 0.639 acres of potentially non-jurisdictional features.

The pipeline project will utilize both open trenching and horizontal directional drilling construction methods. Horizontal directional drilling is a construction method that is effective at minimizing disturbance on the surrounding environment. Open trenching

construction involves surface and subsurface disturbance. However, the specific construction plan has not been determined.

It is not clear if the habitat could or would be able to be restored to pre-activity condition, as it depends on the depth of the hardpan and the depth of the trench, since the ephemeral drainages appear to be vernal swales, which likely hold water due to a clay layer. If the layer is perforated, the water will percolate down, and the wetland will not recover even if the contour and vegetation is restored. Therefore, the project could be constructed to avoid wetlands and waters using directional drilling or provide geotechnical data that demonstrates impacts would not be permanent (ie. the trench does not permeate the clay layer) and restore the habitat to pre-activity condition. If construction impacts are temporary and restored to pre project conditions within a year, no mitigation fees would be required for the project.

Exact impact acreages will be determined through the permit process, and acreages of onsite and offsite wetlands presented in this document represent approximations based on the best information available at this time. By avoiding or mitigating for loss of waters and wetlands through the SSHCP, impacts to wetland resources will be *less than significant*



Plate IS-17 Wetland Delineation (Map 3)

LEGEND	F	Potentially Jurisdictional	Features		1991 A. B. S. 19 5 B. S. 19	Directions to Site:
Sample Point	Waters of the	U.S.		0.070	The week of the second se	From downtown Sacramento, east on
☆ Coordinate Label	Box Culvert (BC	21)		0.023		State Highway 50, southeast on Highway 16 left on Grant Line Road, left and right on
⊢ – (Culvert	Intermittent Dra	inage (ID1)		0.033		Klefer Boulevard to access Project Area.
Study Area (16.59 ac)	Perennial Drain	nage (PD1)		0.014	3 28	Delineated by:
Potentially Jurisdictional Features (0.070 ac)	Тс	otal Potentially Jurisdiction	onal Features:	0.070	18	C. Battaglia and B. Splittstoesser on July 13-14, and 23, 2020.
Box Culvert (0.023 ac)	Pot	Potentially Non-Jurisdictional Features				0 100 200
Intermittent Drainage (0.033 ac)	Ephemeral Dra	inage		0.616	and the second se	
Perennial Drainage (0.014 ac)	ED1	0.003 ED4	0.032		14	FEET NORTH
Non-Jurisdictional Features (0.616 ac)	ED2	0.073 ED5	0.038			Aerial Image: ESRI Imaery 11/10/2019
Ephemeral Drainage (0.616 ac)	ED3	0.098 ED6	0.372		Locator Map	60636607 SAC GIS 010 8/20
> Flow Direction	Total P	otentially Non-Jurisdiction	onal Features:	0.616		August 27, 2020



Plate IS-18 Wetland Delineation (Map 1)

LEGEND

0	Sample Point
÷	Coordinate Label
+	(Culvert
	Study Area (16.59 ac)
Pote	ntially Jurisdictional Features (0.070 ac)
	Box Culvert (0.023 ac)
	Intermittent Drainage (0.033 ac)
	Perennial Drainage (0.014 ac)
Non-	Jurisdictional Features (0.616 ac)
	Ephemeral Drainage (0.616 ac)
-	Flow Direction

Waters of the U.S.	0.070
Box Culvert (BC1)	0.023
Intermittent Drainage (ID1)	0.033
Perennial Drainage (PD1)	0.014
Total Potentially Jurisdictional Features:	0.070

Ephemeral Dra	inage			0.616
ED1	0.003	ED4	0.032	
ED2	0.073	ED5	0.038	
ED3	0.098	ED6	0.372	



Directions to Site: From downtown Sacramento, east on State Highway 50, southeast on Highway 16, left on Grant Line Road, left and right on Kiefer Boulevard to access Project Area.

Delineated by: C. Battaglia and B. Splittstoesser on July 13-14, and 23, 2020.



Aerial Image: ESRI Imaery 11/10/2019 60636607 SAC GIS 008 8/20

August 27, 2020



Plate IS-19 Wetland Delineation (Map 2)

Perennial Draina	age (PD1)			0.014			
Total Potentially Jurisdictional Features:							
Pote	ntially Non-	Jurisdiction	I Features				
Ephemeral Drain	nage			0.616			
ED1	0.003	ED4	0.032				
ED2	0.073	ED5	0.038				
ED3	0.098	ED6	0.372				
Total Po	tentially Nor	n-Jurisdictio	nal Features:	0.616			





Aerial Image: ESRI Imaery 11/10/2019 60636607 SAC GIS 009 8/20

August 27, 2020

Box Culvert (0.023 ac)

---> Flow Direction

Intermittent Drainage (0.033 ac) Perennial Drainage (0.014 ac)

Non-Jurisdictional Features (0.616 ac)

Ephemeral Drainage (0.616 ac)

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

BURROWING OWL (ATHENE CUNICULARIA)

Western Burrowing Owl is a California Species of Special Concern, and a covered species under the SSHCP. The SSHCP indentifies the project site as modeled species habitat for burrowing owl; therefore, specific burrowing owl AMMs are required. Western burrowing owls are year-long residents in generally flat, open dry grasslands, pastures, deserts, and shrub lands, and in grass, forbs and open shrub stages of pinyon-juniper and ponderosa pine habitats. They use communal ground squirrel and other small mammal burrow colonies for nesting and cover, as well as artificial structures such as roadside embankments, levees, berms, and have been observed within railroad right-of-ways. They prefer open, dry, nearly level grassland or prairie habitat and can exhibit high site fidelity, often reusing burrows year after year.

The subject property has suitable habitat for the Burrowing Owl. According to CNDDB data, occurrences of Burrowing Owl have been recorded approximately 0.35 miles northeast from the proposed pipeline route. Disturbing individual owls is considered a significant impact and mitigation in the form of preconstruction surveys is applicable to the current Project for on-site and off-site impacts. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts are *less than significant*.

SWAINSON'S HAWK (BUTEO SWAINSONI)

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed as a Threatened species by the State and is a covered species under the SSHCP. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for Swainson's hawk; therefore, specific Swainson's hawk AMMs are required. 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.

Swainson's hawks feed primarily upon small mammals, birds, and insects. Their typical foraging habitat includes native grasslands, alfalfa and other hay crops that provide suitable habitat for small mammals. Certain other row crops and open habitats also provide some foraging habitat. The availability of productive foraging habitat near a Swainson's hawk's nest site is a critical requirement for nesting and fledgling success. In central California, about 85% of Swainson's hawk nests are within riparian forest or remnant riparian trees. CEQA analysis of impacts to Swainson's hawks consists of separate analyses of impacts to nesting habitat discussion below. The subject property has suitable habitat for Swainson's Hawk. According to CNDDB data, occurrences of Swainson's Hawk have been recorded approximately 1.41 miles southeast from the proposed pipeline route. The SSHCP includes avoidance and minimization measures to implement pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors within ½ mile of ground disturbing activities. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts to Swainson's hawk *are less than significant.*

WHITE-TAILED KITE (ELANUS LEUCURUS)

White-tailed kite is a state "fully protected" raptor and is also protected under the MBTA and a covered species under the SSHCP. White-tailed kites inhabit rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks, and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. It breeds between February and October and feeds on rodents, small reptiles, and large insects in fresh emergent wetlands, annual grasslands, pastures, and ruderal vegetation. The grassland habitat in the Project area provides nesting and foraging habitat for this species. The subject property has suitable habitat for White-Tailed Kite. According to CNDDB data, occurrences of White-Tailed Kite have been recorded approximately 200-feet south from the proposed pipeline route. The SSHCP identifies the project site as modeled species habitat for white tailed kite; therefore, specific raptor AMMs are required. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts *are less than significant.*

TRICOLORED BLACKBIRD (AGELAIUS TRICOLOR)

The tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) is protected under the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503 and 3800). In March of 2019 tricolored blackbird was listed as a State threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act.

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 which 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.

According to CNDDB data, occurrences of Tricolored Blackbird have been recorded approximately 1.41 miles southeast from the proposed pipeline route. Compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required.

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.

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 section 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)).

Tribal Cultural Resource Setting

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, codified as Section 21080.3.1 of CEQA, formal notification letters were sent to those tribes who had previously requested to be notified of Sacramento County projects on June 9, 2020. Responses were received from the United Auburn Indian Community(UAIC).

Discussion of Project Impacts – Tribal Cultural Resources

Through consultation under CEQA, tribes confirmed that the project area does not contain known tribal cultural resources of significance; however, United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) requested that they be contacted in the event that cultural resources are discovered during construction. With this mitigation in place, project impacts to tribal cultural resources will be **less than significant**.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES

MITIGATION MEASURE COMPLIANCE

Comply with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for this project, including the payment of 100% of the Office of Planning and Environmental Review staff costs, and the costs of any technical consultant services incurred during implementation of that Program.

MITIGATION MEASURE A: PARTICIPATION IN THE SSHCP

The applicant shall obtain authorization through the SSHCP prior to all grounddisturbing activities. Authorization under the SSHCP shall include implementation and conformance with all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures (Appendix C, Draft AMMs) and compensation for impacted SSHCP land cover.

MITIGATION MEASURE B: CULTURAL RESOURCES – UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERIES

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.

 The appended Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) Awareness Brochure provides a definition and examples of TCRs that may be encountered during construction. The brochure was developed to assist construction teams with the identification and protection of TCRs. The brochure shall be shared with construction teams prior to ground disturbance.

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 Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments			
1. LAND USE - Would the project:								
a. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				x	The project is consistent with the environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, Cosumnes Community Plan and the 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)?				x	The proposed infrastructure project is intended to continue to provide service for existing or planned development and will not induce substantial unplanned population growth.			
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing people or 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?			Х		There is no conversion of land proposed because the pipeline will be buried underground and located within the County of Sacramento and City of Rancho Cordova right-of-way.			
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?			Х		There is no conversion of land proposed because the pipeline will be buried underground and located within the County of Sacramento and City of Rancho Cordova right-of-way.			

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?			X		There is no conversion of land proposed because the pipeline will be buried underground and located within the County of Sacramento and City of Rancho Cordova right-of-way.
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?				x	The project does not occur in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.
b. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?				x	Construction will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site. The pipeline will be buried underground and will not be visible. The leachate tank and pumps will be located within the perimeter of the Kiefer Landfill and will not be visible to the public.
c. If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				x	The project is not located in an urbanized area.
d. 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?				Х	The project will not be a source of permanent light because it is a pipeline that will be buried underground.
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.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?				X	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?				X	The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.
6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:					
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?				x	The project will not result in increased demand for water supply.
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?			X		The project will result in leachate being discharged to the Sacramento Area Sewer District's (SASD) and Regional San system. According to the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD), a modeling evaluation confirmed that the S138 pump station is able to accommodate the additional 200 GPM flow of leachate from the Kiefer Landfill.
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				x	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?			X		The project proposes construction of a new pipeline that will be buried underground and located within the County of Sacramento and City of Rancho Cordova right-of-way. According to the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD), a modeling evaluation confirmed that the S138 pump station is able to accommodate the additional 200 GPM flow of leachate from the Kiefer Landfill.

		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	Project construction would not require the addition of new stormwater drainage facilities.
f.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?				x	The project will not require new electric or natural gas service.
g.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?				х	The project 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?				x	The project will not require the use of public school services.
i.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?				x	The project will not require park and recreation services.
7.	TRANSPORTATION - Would the project:					
a.	Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) – measuring transportation impacts individually or cumulatively, using a vehicles miles traveled standard established by the County?				x	The proposed pipeline will not produce traffic and therefore does not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3. The project will reduce VMT compared to hauling the leachate by truck to the Regional Treatment Plant.
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 completed project.
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 completed project.;.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
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 meet the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. The Roadway Construction Emissions Model was used to analyze ozone precursor emissions; the project will not result in emissions that exceed standards. Compliance with existing dust abatement rules and implementation of the Air District's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices will ensure that construction air quality impacts are less than significant. Refer to the Air Quality discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?			Х		See Response 8.a.
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		DWMR is responsible for all odor control within its sewer facilities and any impacts caused to SASD facilities at the point of demarcation and downstream. DWMR will take appropriate measures to control odor if Kiefer Landfill wastewater is the source of odor complaints. If it is found that DWMR is responsible for the odor complaint, DWMR will remain engaged at finding a solution and will work collaboratively to resolve any odor issues. The project is not expected to create objectionable odors because of the closed nature of the system.

쁘

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
9. NOISE - Would the project:		<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>		
a. Result in generation of a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				X	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).
c. Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.			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	I the project:				
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?				Х	The project is a public infrastructure project and will not substantially increase water demand over the existing use.
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?				x	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. Post project will not result in flooding.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?			Х		The proposed project is linear and will be constructed within the County of Sacramento and the City of Rancho Cordova right-of-way. Some of the areas are located within 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map and local flood zones. The project will be constructing new infrastructure within the public right- of-way below the surface.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?			Х		Although some areas of the project are within a 100-year floodplain, the new infrastructure will be placed underground thereby not impeding or redirecting flood flows.
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 does not propose any physical changes that would affect runoff from the site.
h. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			Х		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. Refer to the Hydrology and Water Quality discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments				
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:									
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including 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		The majority of the work will occur in the public right-of- way on paved and unpaved surfaces. The trenching activities will temporarily expose and stockpile soils. Compliance with County Stormwater Ordinance and project specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will ensure soils are contained.				
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?				Х	The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit.				
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?				Х	The proposed project will not use septic tanks.				
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?				Х	The project does not impact mineral resources.				
 f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? 				X	No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.				

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments		
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:							
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?		Х			Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts are less than significant		
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?		Х			The project site contains 0.070 acres of potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States and 0.616 acres of potentially non-jurisdictional features. Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts <i>are less than significant</i> . Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects 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			Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts <i>are less than significant.</i> Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.		
 Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species? 		Х			Compliance with the SSHCP will ensure impacts <i>are less than significant.</i> Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects 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?		X			The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources. Refer to the Biological Resources discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.		

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments	
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?		X			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 discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.	
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:						
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?				х	No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project.	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?				x	No known archaeological resources occur on-site.	
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				х	The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains.	
14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the 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?			X		Notification pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1(b) was provided to the tribes and request for consultation was not received. However, the United Auburn Indian Community responded requesting that the tribe's preferred inadvertent discoveries mitigation measure be added to this project. See the Tribal Cultural Resources discussion above.	
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - V	Nould the pr	oject:				
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				х	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material. The leachate is not classified as a hazardous material.	

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?				Х	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
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 does not involve the use or handling of hazardous material.
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?				x	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?				x	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?				x	There is no significant risk of loss, injury, or death to people or structures associated with wildland fires.
16. ENERGY – Would the project:					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction?				х	The proposed project is a pipeline and will be constructed underground. No significant energy impacts will result.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				х	The project will comply with Title 24, Green Building Code, for all project efficiency requirements.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
17. 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	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. Piping the leachate is expected to reduce GHG emissions compared to the existing condition of hauling the leachate with numerous trucks several times per week.
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?				х	The project is consistent with County policies adopted for the purpose or reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	PQP- Cemetery, Public and Quasi-Public	х		
Community Plan	Cosumnes	х		
Land Use Zone	AG-80, Agricultural	х		

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coor	dinator:	Todd Smith		
Section Manager:	Marianne Bir	anne Biner		
Project Leader:	Rebecca Bos	schee		
Initial Review:	Marianne Bir	anne Biner		
Office Manager:	Belinda Wekesa-Batts			
Administrative Supp	ort: Justin	Maulit		