

EIS/EIR APPENDIX F
CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

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 or No Impact	Comments
1. LAND USE - Would the project:				
a. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	X			See Chapter 4.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?	X			See Chapter 4.
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			See Chapter 4 and 16.
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	X			See Chapter 4.
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?	X			See Chapter 6.
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?	X			See Chapter 6.
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?	X			See Chapter 4 and Chapter 6. .

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?			X	Given its nature, the project is not expected to substantially alter the viewshed associated with Highway 16, the River Road or other corridors or vistas when compared to the No Action/No Project Baseline.
b. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	Construction will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site when compared to the No Action/No Project Baseline.
c. Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	The project will not result in a new source of substantial light, glare or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area when compared to the No Action/No Project Baseline.
5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:				
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?	X			See Chapter 4.
b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?	X			See Chapter 4.
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?	X			See Chapter 4.
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			See Chapter 4.
6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:				
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?	X			See Chapter 12.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?	X			See Chapter 12.
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	X			See Chapter 12.
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			See Chapter 12.
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?	X			See Chapter 7 and Chapter 12.
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?	X			See Chapter 12.
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?	X			See chapter 12.
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?			X	The project would not require the construction/expansion of additional new unplanned school facilities compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Established case law, <i>Goleta Union School District v. The Regents of the University of California</i> (36 Cal-App. 4 th 1121, 1995), indicates that school overcrowding, standing alone, is not a change in the physical conditions, and cannot be treated as an impact on the environment.
i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?	X			See Chapter 12.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
7. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				
a. Result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?	X			See Chapter 13.
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?	X			See Chapter 13.
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?	X			See Chapter 13.
d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	X			See Chapter 13.
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			See Chapter 14.
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?	X			See Chapter 14
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X			See Chapter 14
9. NOISE - Would the project:				
a. Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	Compared to the No Action/No Project alternative, the project is not expected to result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			X	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 these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?	X			See Chapter 7.
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			See Chapter 7.
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?	X			See Chapter 7
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?	X			See Chapter 7.
e. 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?	X			See Chapter 7
f. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	X			See Chapter 7
g. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?	X			See Chapter 7.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	X			See Chapter 5.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?	X			See Chapter 5.
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?	X			See Chapter 5.
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?	X			See Chapter 5.
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?	X			See Chapter 5.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	X			See Chapter 5.
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	X			See Chapters 8 and 9.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?	X			See Chapter 8.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?	X			See Chapters 8 and 9.
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?	X			See Chapters 8 and 9.
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?	X			See chapter 8.
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?	X			See Chapters 1, 8 and 9.
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			See Chapter 4.
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?	X			See Chapter 11.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?	X			See Chapter 11.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	X			See Chapter 11.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	X			See Chapter 11,
14. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	<p>Chapter 5, condition 10 of the SSHCP identifies responsibilities of the implementing agency, which will reduce impacts associated with hazardous materials to less than significant levels. The responsibilities are described below:</p> <p><i>Prior to the acquisition of a preserve site or implementation of a stream or riparian restoration project, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted in general accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials Standard Practice E1527-05. The purpose of this Environmental Site Assessment is to identify, to the extent feasible pursuant to the American Society for Testing and Materials Standard, recognized environmental conditions in connection with the potential site. The term "recognized environmental condition" means the presence or likely presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products on the property under conditions that may indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of release of these substances to the property. If the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment indicates the presence of a recognized environmental condition, the Implementing Entity shall consider the following options.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Determine that the acquisition/project can proceed on the basis that the Habitat Plan goals and objectives can be met on the site even with the presence of a recognized environmental condition.</i> • <i>Conduct a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, including soil and groundwater testing, to further study the potential for contamination to limit the Implementing Entity's management activities.</i>

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the results of the Phase I (or Phase II) Environmental Site Assessment indicate that the Habitat Plan goals and objectives cannot be met on the site, the Implementing Entity should not acquire the site. <p>As part of each Preserve Management Plan or site restoration plan, a Contingency Plan shall be prepared to address the actions that would be taken during construction in the event that unexpected contaminated soil or groundwater is discovered. The Contingency Plan shall include health and safety considerations, handling and disposal of wastes, reporting requirements, and emergency procedures. The Contingency Plan shall include a requirement that if evidence of contaminated materials is encountered during construction, construction would cease immediately and applicable requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Release Compensation and Liability Act and the California Code of Regulations Title 22 regarding the disposal of waste would be implemented.</p>
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?			X	See 14.a (above).
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	See 14.a (above)
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	<p>See 14.a (above). The project would not interfere with any ongoing clean-up efforts of known hazardous materials sites.</p> <p><i>The Implementing Entity will take the following steps when reviewing and considering any fee title or conservation easement acquisition, in addition to any steps required to comply with applicable federal and state laws governing real estate transactions:</i></p> <p><i>Determine landowner interest in selling an easement or selling in</i></p>

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
				<p><i>fee title. Approach property owner with proposal to acquire land through conservation easement or fee title.</i></p> <p><i>The Implementing Entity will obtain a title report to determine if there are encumbrances that might exclude property from acquisition. Properties with encumbered water rights or surface mineral rights that cannot be subordinated to a conservation easement or habitat protection interest will be excluded from acquisition unless these encumbrances do not influence the integrity of the proposed Preserve. A Phase I survey with an environmental determination document for the presence of hazardous materials will be included with the title report.</i></p>
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.
15. 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			See Chapter 15 of the EIS/EIR.

