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: PLNP2012-00092

2. Title and Short Description of Project: SACRAMENTO COUNTY DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

   The Zoning Code Update consists of four primary actions:

   **A comprehensive update to the Sacramento County Zoning Code.** This new Zoning Code contains many procedural changes in a user-friendly format with clear standards, illustrations, a simple land use entitlement process, and will help to implement General Plan policies that promote mixed-use and sustainable development practices. The project does not include any site-specific development proposals.

   Important changes to this new Zoning Code include:

   - Consolidation of uses, addition of new use standards (notably solar and wind energy facility development standards), a new minor use permit process, and changes to hearing authorities.
   - New mixed-use zones that would permit a greater mix of uses, higher intensity/density at appropriate locations, promote economic development, place-making opportunities, enhanced pedestrian circulation and improved transit access.
   - New specific uses, including solar and wind-energy facilities and use of cargo containers for storage in limited zones.
   - Revision of some development standards, including minimum lot areas, setbacks and structure massing.
   - Reductions in the minimum required number of parking spaces for several types of land uses, more options for shared and reduced parking, and new Low Impact Development (LID) guidelines.

   Revision of the IR zone description, from Industrial Reserve to Interim Agricultural Reserve. Several land use zones such as the Shopping Center (SC), Highway Travel Commercial (TC) and Auto Commercial (AC) zones are proposed as obsolete zones, and as such will be relocated to Title IV of the Zoning Code, which describes the interim and obsolete land use zones. Current uses in these zones will be granted the same rights and entitlements that are available today, but the County will not support proposals to expand these land use districts.

   **An amendment to the Sacramento County General Plan.** A General Plan amendment is proposed in conjunction with this comprehensive update. The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate the new mixed-use zones within the Zoning Consistency Matrix of the General Plan’s Land Use Element. In addition, the SC, TC and AC zones, which are proposed as obsolete zones, will be incorporated into the Interim Zoning Consistency Matrix of the Land Use Element.

Document Released 8/8/14
Adoption of Countywide Design Guidelines.
Amendments to Sacramento County Code Title 22 Land Development Ordinance.
These amendments would to eliminate any overlap with the Zoning Code and Design Guidelines and to clarify review procedures.

3. **Assessor’s Parcel Number:** N/A

4. **Location of Project:** UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY

5. **Project Applicant:** Sacramento County Community Development Department, Planning and Environmental Review

6. Said project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:
   a) It will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
   b) It will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
   c) It will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
   d) It will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

7. As a result thereof, the preparation of an environmental impact report pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California) is not required.

8. The attached Initial Study has been prepared by the Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Review Division in support of this Negative Declaration. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Planning and Environmental Review Division at 827 Seventh Street, Room 220, Sacramento, California, 95814, or phone (916) 874-7914.

[Original Signature on File]
Catherine Hack
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR OF
SACRAMENTO COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
The Zoning Code Update consists of four primary actions:

1) **A comprehensive update to the Sacramento County Zoning Code.** This new Zoning Code contains many procedural changes in a user-friendly format with clear standards, illustrations, a simple land use entitlement process, and will help to implement General Plan policies that promote mixed-use and sustainable development practices. The project does not include any site-specific development proposals.

   Important changes to this new Zoning Code include:

   - Consolidation of uses, addition of new use standards (notably solar and wind energy facility development standards), a new minor use permit process, and changes to hearing authorities.

   - New mixed-use zones that would permit a greater mix of uses, higher intensity/density at appropriate locations, promote economic development, place-making opportunities, enhanced pedestrian circulation and improved transit access.
• New specific uses, including solar and wind-energy facilities and use of cargo containers for storage in limited zones.

• Revision of some development standards, including minimum lot areas, setbacks and structure massing.

• Reductions in the minimum required number of parking spaces for several types of land uses, more options for shared and reduced parking, and new Low Impact Development (LID) guidelines.

• Revision of the IR zone description, from Industrial Reserve to Interim Agricultural Reserve.

Several land use zones such as the Shopping Center (SC), Highway Travel Commercial (TC) and Auto Commercial (AC) zones are proposed as obsolete zones, and as such will be relocated to Title IV of the Zoning Code, which describes the interim and obsolete land use zones. Current uses in these zones will be granted the same rights and entitlements that are available today, but the County will not support proposals to expand these land use districts.

2) An amendment to the Sacramento County General Plan. A General Plan amendment is proposed in conjunction with this comprehensive update. The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate the new mixed-use zones within the Zoning Consistency Matrix of the General Plan’s Land Use Element. In addition, the SC, TC and AC zones, which are proposed as obsolete zones, will be incorporated into the Interim Zoning Consistency Matrix of the Land Use Element.

3) Adoption of Countywide Design Guidelines.

4) Amendments to Sacramento County Code Title 22 Land Development Ordinance. These amendments would to eliminate any overlap with the Zoning Code and Design Guidelines and to clarify review procedures.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Sacramento County was incorporated in 1850 as one of the original 27 counties of the State of California, and is currently governed by the Board of Supervisors, with an appointed County Executive to run the day-to-day County business. The County lies within the Central Valley of California, and is bordered to the west by Yolo and Solano Counties, to the north by Sutter and Placer counties, to the east by El Dorado and Amador counties, and to the south by San Joaquin and Contra Costa counties. With a land area of approximately 994 square miles, the County encompasses 25 communities, including seven incorporated cities: Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton and Rancho Cordova. Most of these communities are in the urbanized core in the western, northwestern or northern portion of the County. The southwestern, eastern and southern portions of the County are more agricultural and rural-residential in character. The current Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy indicates that there were 554,285 housing units in 2008, with growth projected to accommodate 620,982 units by 2020 and 734,023 by 2035.¹ According to the most recent census (2005), the County’s population was more than 1.3 million.

The County is a center of government, trade, transportation and agriculture, and is consequently a major transportation hub. Interstates 80 and 5; U.S. Highway 50; and State Highways 99, 16 and 160 connect the outer edges of the County with downtown Sacramento. Similarly, all of the rail lines in the County converge in Sacramento at the old Sacramento Rail Yard. Airports include Sacramento International, Sacramento Executive, Mather Airport, McClellan Airfield as well as several smaller airports.

Physically, Sacramento County lies just north of the center of the Central Valley. The confluence of two major rivers, the Sacramento and the American, occurs within the County. The County’s southwestern panhandle extends far into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, to the point just north of Antioch, where nearly all waters of the Central Valley converge. To the south, San Joaquin County is primarily agricultural. The wooded foothills of the Sierra Nevada rise to the east in Amador and El Dorado Counties. On the north, Placer County has experienced dramatic growth over the past decade, and much of the grasslands adjacent to the northern Sacramento County boundary have been converted to residential uses. Yolo and Sutter Counties to the northwest and west have experienced growth as well, although agricultural uses remain.

Before the advent of intensive agriculture and urbanization, the Sacramento County landscape was characterized by limited oak savannah and riparian woodland, with an herbaceous layer of perennial grasses and both annual and perennial wildflowers. Riparian woodland areas lined the County’s three main rivers, the Sacramento, American and Cosumnes, and tributary creeks. Expansive native grassland stretched out from riparian woodland edges and formed the bulk of the County’s landscape. Vernal pools were scattered in both low and high density clusters throughout the valley grassland habitat. After European settlement, native perennial grasses were largely replaced by Mediterranean annual grasses. However, within the vernal pools native vegetation uniquely suited to springtime inundation survived. Today these vernal pools still harbor a number of listed plant and animal species. In addition to vernal pools, other seasonal and emergent wetlands occurred, mostly in association with the many natural drainage systems that previously flowed through the County, but which are now either channelized or confined within a system of artificial levees.

**ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

See the Initial Study Checklist attached to this report and the following analysis. The Initial Study Checklist indicated that certain “issue areas” did not require additional substantial analysis or discussion, including agricultural resources, aesthetics, airports, hydrology and water quality, biological resources and greenhouse gas emissions/climate change. The remaining issues discussed below include impacts related to land use (including noise), public services, transportation/traffic, air quality and cultural resources.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposed project is a comprehensive update to the Sacramento County Zoning Code, following the adoption of the Sacramento County General Plan of 2005-2030 on November 9, 2011. The General Plan calls for amending the Zoning Code throughout, as the primary instrument for General Plan implementation. Last updated in 1983, the Zoning Code Update (ZCU) would promote sustainable land use, ensure public health, safety and welfare, and provide for new land uses previously not conceived. The ZCU does not change zoning per se for any parcel; however, the Update introduces new land uses, changes some development standards and administrative procedures, and generally attempts to simplify the entitlement process. Appendix 1 illustrates key changes to the Code; specific development standards are set forth in *Environmental Setting*, below.

Accompanying the ZCU are the Countywide Design Guidelines, which would create design recommendations and standards for project review, and supplement the ZCU.
The project also includes a text amendment to the General Plan that places new mixed-use zones within the Zoning Consistency Matrix of the Land Use Element, implementing the Mixed-Use Alternative described in the Sacramento County General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report (GPFEIR).\(^2\) The amendment would also place obsolete zones (Shopping Center (SC), Highway Travel Commercial (TC) and Auto Commercial (AC) zones) into the Interim Zoning Consistency Matrix. Finally, the project includes minor changes to Title 22, the County Land Development Ordinance, intended to eliminate any overlaps with the ZCU and Design Guidelines, and to clarify review procedures.

For simplicity, the whole project is referenced as the “Zoning Code Update” or “ZCU.”

The County of Sacramento, Department of Community Development, Planning & Environmental Review Division, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the environmental analysis for the proposed project may use the analysis prepared for the GPFEIR and subsequent approved amendments, as allowed under CEQA Guidelines § 15152, Tiering. Tiering permits a lead agency to avoid repetitive description and analysis of general issues that were evaluated at a larger scale in an earlier environmental document, and to focus on the specific issues presented by a policy, plan or project.

Accordingly, this Initial Study evaluates whether the subsequent project (the ZCU) was anticipated by the GPU FEIR and whether the subsequent project may cause any additional significant effect on the environment that was not previously examined in the GPU FEIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15177). From the analysis that follows, the County has determined that updating the Zoning Code reasonably flows from the adoption of the 2030 General Plan Update and the General Plan Update FEIR, and that no additional significant environmental effect will arise from its adoption.

This analysis incorporates by reference the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR (Control No. 2002-GPB-0105, SCH #2007082086), the 2030 General Plan Update, the 2030 General Plan Update Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Sacramento County Climate Action Plan, June 2012. The GPU FEIR is available for public review at County of Sacramento Community Development Department, 827 7th St., 2nd floor, Sacramento, CA, 95827, and online at http://www.per.saccounty.net/LandUseRegulationDocuments/Pages/GeneralPlanUpdate.aspx.

\(^2\) The GPFEIR evaluated the then-proposed General Plan; after deliberation and findings, the Board of Supervisors adopted a modified version of Mixed Use Alternative 3 (Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011).
LAND USE

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: LAND USE
Sacramento County is bordered to the west by Yolo and Solano Counties, to the north by Sutter and Placer counties, the east by El Dorado and Amador counties, and to the south by San Joaquin and Contra Costa counties. Encompassing approximately 994 square miles, the County includes seven incorporated cities: Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton and Rancho Cordova; however the project applies only to the unincorporated areas of the County.

The most recent Zoning Code was enacted in 1993. Much of the ZCU would not change existing Code language or existing zoning designations. However, notable aspects of development standards would change, including those associated with setbacks, lot area, and building height and bulk in some zones. The ZCU would not change other County regulations, such as the Noise Ordinance, Tree Ordinance, County Climate Action Plan, or various Special Planning Area ordinances, and Development Agreements.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA: LAND USE
Based on the CEQA Guidelines, a land use impact is significant if project implementation will:

1. Significantly 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.

2. Result in significant physical disruption or division of an established community.

3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

4. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

5. Convert a substantial amount of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.

6. Result in an airport safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

The accompanying Initial Study Checklist ruled out potential impacts resulting from ZCU adoption with respect to Nos. 2-6 above. However, issues such as newly-defined uses, setback reductions, and other development standard changes may result in adverse impacts.
**Impact Discussion: Land Use**

**Impact (New Land Uses):** The proposed ZCU would introduce three mixed-use zoning designations; it would also set forth regulations for use of cargo containers as outside storage in agricultural, recreation, commercial and industrial zones.

**Mixed-Use Zoning Districts.** Mixed uses are categorized into three zoning district designations, Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers (NMC), Community-Regional Mixed-Use Centers (CMC) and Corridor Mixed-Use Zones (CMZ). Conventional zoning patterns separate land uses, e.g. residential from commercial uses, or single-family residential from multiple-family residential uses. Mixed-use zoning attempts to combine such uses on the same or adjacent land, along with development controls to avoid incompatible combinations and to encourage active, sub-urban to urban neighborhood development. Generally, mixed-use zoning districts would accommodate development intensities and patterns that would, in turn, support using transportation alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle, such as transit, bicycles or walking. As such, mixed-use projects are intended to encourage human activity and social interaction, to reduce miles traveled in single-occupant vehicles (thus reducing vehicular emissions), and to use land more efficiently.

The 2030 General Plan incorporates the Mixed-Use Alternative described in the General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, setting forth goals and policies for mixed-use, transit-oriented development in specified growth areas of the County (2030 General Plan Land Use Element pp. 9-11). The ZCU sets forth development standards and project review criteria, but does not assign mixed-use zoning designations for any particular parcel (ZCU §5.7).

Establishing any of the mixed-use zoning districts would require that a project proponent request a rezone from the Board of Supervisors. Rezoning, a discretionary action, is subject to CEQA analysis, and would likely be accompanied by specific project plans submitted for design review. Project impacts would thus be evaluated and avoided or minimized. All subsequent mixed-use projects in the NMC, CMC, and CMZ would require design review and conformance to performance standards, including floor area and setback requirements, parking, streetscape design and character, landscaping and street trees, neighborhood compatibility, noise, lighting, signage, and trash/recycling enclosures (ZCU §5.7.3). Numerous individual uses are allowed by right in the mixed-use zones; however, the zoning change, a discretionary action subject to CEQA review, must be accomplished before those uses could be introduced. Accordingly, because CEQA review would be required to establish mixed-use zones, and the ZCU does not, by itself, assign zoning designations or promote or authorize any particular project, rather establishing standards that would regulate such use, impacts resulting from ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.
Cargo containers as outside storage. The ZCU introduces cargo containers as an accessory use in agricultural, agricultural-residential, recreation, commercial and industrial zoning districts. Cargo containers range from commercial PODS®, with dimensions from seven or 16-feet long, eight feet wide and eight feet high, to shipping containers, with dimensions of 20 or 40-feet long, eight feet wide and 8.5' high. PODS® or similar containers would be permitted as a temporary use in all zones for 48 hours or fewer (ZCU Table 3.2, Allowed Accessory Uses, Note 40). Introducing such containers could result in impacts related to aesthetics and neighborhood compatibility, and nuisance activities, such as graffiti. However, specific development standards would apply to minimize impacts, specifically (ZCU §3.9.3(T)):

- In agricultural, agricultural-residential, recreation districts:
  - Minimum lot size of two acres
  - Prohibition against stacking containers
  - Screening requirement from right-of-ways with landscaping or fencing
  - Maximum of one container per property
  - Placement permitted only in rear or interior side yards
  - Must be painted solid neutral color, without signage, and kept free of graffiti

- In commercial and industrial districts:
  - Must be placed within buildable portion of lot (not in required setback areas)
  - Must not be placed in required parking or landscaping areas
  - Must be painted solid neutral color, without signage, and kept free of graffiti

Since the ZCU does not, by itself, place cargo containers on any property, and given the temporary nature of the use and the standards in place for said use, impacts resulting from ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.

Impact (Setback reductions): The proposed ZCU changes various setbacks in higher-density residential zones (RD-5 through RD-40), the Business Park (BP), General Commercial (GC), Limited Commercial (LC), and Industrial Office Park (MP) zones. Setback reductions would effectively increase land use intensity by increasing the buildable area of a lot; setback increases would separate more intense uses from lesser ones. As in the existing Zoning Code, setbacks vary depending on the existence of Public Utility and Public Facility easements (PUPFs), as well as on adjacent land uses and zones. Setback dimensions are summarized in Table 1 below. All dimensions are in feet; front and side street setbacks are measured from the back of the curb, and interior side and rear yard setbacks are measured from the respective property lines.
Table 1 – Existing and Proposed Setback Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone/Setback</th>
<th>Existing ZC</th>
<th>ZCU</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without PUPFs/</td>
<td>Without PUPFs/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With PUPFS</td>
<td>With PUPFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD-5 – RD-7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>20’/24’</td>
<td>15’/19’</td>
<td>Reduced 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side</td>
<td>5’ (1 or 2 stories)</td>
<td>5’ (1 or 2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>10’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10’ (zero-lot-line, 1 or 2 stories)</td>
<td>10’ (zero-lot-line, 1 or 2 stories)</td>
<td>Reduced 15’ for 3-stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50’ (zero-lot-line, 3+ stories)</td>
<td>50’ (optional for zero-lot-line, 3+ stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>25’ (lots ≥125’ deep)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% avg lot depth, (lots &lt;125’ deep)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>Reduced 15’, 1-story Reduced 10’, 2-stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street</td>
<td>12.5’ (corner lots, no sidewalk)</td>
<td>12.5’ (corner lots, no sidewalk)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5’ (corner lots with sidewalk)</td>
<td>16.5’ (corner lots with sidewalk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD-10 – RD-15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multi-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>18’/24’</td>
<td>Reduced 7’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street</td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>18’/24’</td>
<td>Reduced 7’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD-20 – RD-25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multi-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>15’/21’</td>
<td>Reduced 10’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone/Setback</td>
<td>Existing ZC</td>
<td>ZCU</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without PUPFs/ With PUPFS</td>
<td>Without PUPFs/ With PUPFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing ZC</td>
<td>ZCU</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side street</strong></td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>15’/21’</td>
<td>Reduced 10’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD-30 – RD-40 (multi-family)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front</strong></td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>12’/18’</td>
<td>Reduced 13’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>10’ (1 story)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td>15’ (2 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td>20’ (3 stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>25’ (&lt; 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td>100’ (≥ 2 stories, adj to low-density residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side street</strong></td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>12’/18’</td>
<td>Reduced 13’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Park (BP) in residential zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front</strong></td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>25’/31’</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0’ (adj. to non-res, non-ag uses)</td>
<td>0’ (adj. to non-res, non-ag uses)</td>
<td>Increased side yard width with BP structure height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’ (adj to res, ag uses)</td>
<td>20’ (adj to res, ag uses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0’ (adj. to non-res, non-ag uses)</td>
<td>0’ (adj. to non-res, non-ag uses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’ (adj to res, ag uses)</td>
<td>25’ (adj to res, ag uses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side street</strong></td>
<td>31’/25’</td>
<td>19’/25’</td>
<td>Reduced 12’ without PUPFs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 1, residential front yard setbacks are reduced by five to 13 feet, depending on residential density; interior side yards in the RD-5 and RD-7 zone districts are reduced by 15 feet, and rear yards are reduced by 10 to 15 feet. Side yards are increased to 25 feet in the BP district, unless adjacent to a residential district, where the interior side setback is increased to 44 feet. Rear yards in GC and LC zones are reduced by 35 feet.
Reducing front setbacks means that building façades could be constructed closer to the street, changing the streetscape’s visual and aesthetic characteristics. Occupants of such structures could be exposed to a greater degree of street noise, odors and vehicle emissions, and the surrounding neighborhood character could be adversely affected by inferior design. Additionally, reducing interior side and rear yard setbacks in residential zones means that homes could be built closer together, potentially exposing occupants to excessive noise and odors. Occupants of residential-commercial mixed-use developments could be subject to offensive odors from vehicle emissions from drive-through corridors or from auto-repair businesses, simply because those uses could foreseeably be placed nearby without additional environmental review. Finally, overall setback reductions on smaller lots would likely result in greater impermeable area within a development, since building footprints could conceivably occupy the entire buildable area of a lot.

Any new project that requires a subdivision or other discretionary entitlement would be subject to CEQA and aesthetic – and other – impacts avoided or minimized accordingly. Such projects would also be required to comply with the Countywide Design Guidelines and the Design Review process (ZCU §6.3.2). Where discretionary entitlements would not be required, all projects comprising 20 residential units or more, or at a residential density of eight dwelling units per acre would still be subject to Design Review and compliance with the County Design Guidelines, including conformance to neighborhood compatibility requirements (ZCU §6.3.2(A)).

All projects would be subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 24, §1207, Sound Transmission) that set maximum sound-transmission levels for interior and exterior residential building walls. Additionally, all new mixed-use development would be subject to the Mixed-Use development design standards (ZCU §5.7.3), including ZCU §5.7.3(B)(9), Noise Standards. Commercial development that would include a residential component within 25 feet of an arterial or thoroughfare right-of-way would be required to submit an acoustical analysis that would demonstrate that interior noise would not exceed 45 dB Ldn under future traffic conditions (ZCU §5.5.2(A)). Finally, the Sacramento County Noise Ordinance and noise-related Building Code regulations would apply to all projects.

Projects that are likely to generate excessive odors, except for agricultural operations, which are protected by the County right-to-farm ordinance, are typically intensive uses that would require use permits in zones where lower-density residential uses are allowed. Use permits would trigger CEQA review and applicable mitigation; use permits also require findings that the project would be compatible with adjacent uses (including odor) (ZCU §6.4.3(E)(d)). Additionally, any nearby odor-generating uses would be subject to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Rule 402, Nuisance, incorporating language from California Health and Safety Code §41700, that
prohibits odors causing “injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or the public” or endangers health and safety.

Reduced setbacks and greater development density could result in increased impermeable area and storm water runoff because building pads, pavement and other infrastructure would cover soil that would otherwise absorb and filter incident rainfall. Less area assigned to landscaping would concurrently mean less available area for stormwater retention features. However, most new development in the unincorporated County would be subject to the requirements of the recently-updated County Stormwater Design Manual, which sets forth mandatory and recommended stormwater quality control measures for residential, commercial and industrial development, particularly their associated parking lots (Sacramento County Dept. of Water Resources, Stormwater Quality Program, Stormwater Design Manual for the Sacramento Region, May 2014, available at http://www.waterresources.saccounty.net/stormwater/Pages/default.aspx)(accessed 8/7/2014)). Such measures would maximize a site’s infiltration potential and reduce associated water quality and storm water runoff impacts to less than significant levels.

In light of the discussion above, and given that the ZCU does not, by itself, propose or authorize any particular project or development, and that existing regulations or future CEQA review would serve to address potential impacts of future projects, impacts resulting from reduced setbacks are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Impact (Reduced parking requirements could result in secondary impacts to traffic and circulation):** The ZCU would reduce parking requirements for banks, cemeteries/funeral homes, churches, colleges, K-12 schools, hospitals, banks/savings and loans, general office uses, medical and dental offices, congregate care, general retail shopping centers, fitness centers, stand-alone swimming pools, and some manufacturing uses. Table 2 lists these changes. New parking standards for mixed-use developments in the NMC, CMC and CMZ are set forth in ZCU §5.7.3(B)(5), Off-Street Parking, and are generally consistent with Table 2, except that on-street parking would be allowed as part of a project’s required parking, some required parking could be shared among uses, and parking reductions are available for projects that expressly reduce parking demand or vehicle trips.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Existing Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Requirement</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank/S&amp;L</td>
<td>5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Rooms</td>
<td>1/1 seat</td>
<td>1/3 seats</td>
<td>Reduced 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, Funeral Homes</td>
<td>1/2 seats</td>
<td>1/5 seats or 28/1000 sq. ft. if no fixed seating</td>
<td>Reduced 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>1/3 seats</td>
<td>1/4 seats, or 1/50 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1/3 employees, 1/2 students</td>
<td>1/3 employees, 1/3 students</td>
<td>Student parking reduced 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate care</td>
<td>1/3 beds</td>
<td>1/3 beds, plus 1/3 employees</td>
<td>Added employee parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and middle schools</td>
<td>1/1 employee, 1/3 seats in auditorium</td>
<td>1/1 employee, 1/10 seats in auditorium, space for 2 buses</td>
<td>Assembly parking reduced by 70%, Added bus parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Centers</td>
<td>1/2 occupants (based on occupancy of gym area)</td>
<td>1/1.5 occupants or 6/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General retail/shopping centers</td>
<td>4.5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4.0/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Assembly &amp; Processing</td>
<td>1/500 sq. ft. (= 4/2000)</td>
<td>1/2000 sq. ft. OR 1/employee plus 1/company vehicle</td>
<td>Reduced 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>1/1 employee, 1/3 students</td>
<td>1/1 employee, 1/5 students</td>
<td>Student parking reduced 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2/1 bed</td>
<td>2/bed, plus 1/3 employees</td>
<td>Added employee parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/dental</td>
<td>6.5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4.5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>4.5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3.5/1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Reduced 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>1/100 sq. ft. pool area (=5/500)</td>
<td>1/500 sq. ft. pool area</td>
<td>Reduced 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, reduction of parking alone is not a per se physical environmental impact, since reducing on-site, off-street parking is consistent with goals and policies for vehicle trip reduction and miles traveled (see, e.g., 2030 General Plan Air Quality Element, 3 Percentages are rounded to nearest multiple of 5.
Policies AQ-5, AQ-8, AQ-9). However, secondary impacts – traffic congestion, emissions from idling vehicles – can occur where parking for individual vehicles is limited or unavailable. These impacts would be avoided or minimized by continued adherence to these 2030 General Plan policies and implementation measures as development proceeds:

AQ-5. Reduce emissions associated with vehicle miles travelled and evaporation by reducing the surface area dedicated to parking facilities; reduce vehicle emissions associated with “hunting” for on-street parking by implementing innovative parking solutions including shared parking, elimination of minimum parking requirements, creation of maximum parking requirements, and utilize performance pricing for publicly owned parking spaces both on- and off-street, as well as creating parking benefit districts.

AQ-6. Provide incentives for the use of transportation alternatives, including a program for the provision of financial incentives for builders that construct ownership housing within a quarter mile of existing and proposed light rail stations.

AQ-7. Implement a model trip reduction program for County employees which may include, but not be limited to, flexible and compressed work schedules, commuter matching services, telecommuting, preferential carpool/vanpool parking, carpool/vanpool and transit subsidies, and all other commute alternative incentives.

AQ-8. Promote mixed-use development and provide for increased development intensity along existing and proposed transit corridors to reduce the length and frequency of vehicle trips.

AQ-9. When park-and-ride facilities are requested by transit providers, the spaces provided for the park-and-ride facility may be counted as part of the total amount of parking required by the zoning code.

AQ-10. Encourage vehicle trip reduction and improved air quality by requiring development projects that exceed the SMAQMD’s significance thresholds for operational emissions to provide on-going, cost-effective mechanisms for transportation services that help reduce the demand for existing roadway infrastructure.

AQ-11. Encourage contractors operating in the County to procure and to operate low-emission vehicles, and to seek low emission fleet status for their off-road equipment.
Applicable implementation measures from these policies (2030 General Plan Air Quality Element, pp. 4-5):

B. Support the use of demand management and pricing controls to accelerate and strengthen market-based strategies consistent with the General Plan.

C. Work with SMAQMD, Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), and the business community to create trip reduction goals, a program to implement controls such as flexible and compressed work schedules, commuter matching services for vanshare and rideshare programs, telecommuting, preferential carpool/vanpool parking, parking pricing, transit subsidies, and other controls as may be necessary to obtain and monitor County trip reduction goals.

D. Implement traffic signal preemption for transit vehicles to provide consistency and dependability in transit schedules.

E. Reassess Sacramento County and parking standards for maximization of Transportation Control Measure (TCM) effectiveness.

F. Implement and enforce the County Zoning Code Developer Transportation Systems Management provisions.

The ZCU does not propose or authorize any development, and future development under the ZCU would occur with the above policies and implementation measures in place. Moreover, establishing mixed-use zoning would require CEQA review, where impacts resulting from reduced parking standards would be addressed. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be less than significant.
PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: WATER SUPPLY

The Sacramento County GPFEIR Chapter 6, Water Supply, shows that water for urban and non-urban demands primarily comes from surface water sources or local groundwater aquifers. Recycled or remediated water contributes a small fraction to the total supply. Twenty-eight water purveyors supply water to customers within Sacramento County (see Plate WS-1, Sacramento County Water Purveyors, GPFEIR p. 6-2). The amount of water available to these purveyors to supply the proposed General Plan’s land uses is defined by their individual water rights, surface water contracts, groundwater pumping limitations, and the infrastructure necessary to treat, pump, and deliver water (See GPFEIR pp. 6-1 – 6-18 for detailed background description).

Distinct geohydrologic conditions or other restrictions affect purveyors’ ability to provide water. The area north of the American River is underlain by the North Groundwater Basin (Plate WS-2, Sacramento County Groundwater Basins, GPFEIR p. 6-3). This basin has exhibited an unacceptable groundwater elevation decline from excessive pumping, and is currently managed by the Sacramento Groundwater Authority. The groundwater management plan, intended to maintain and protect the basin’s long term sustainable yield and quality, is available at www.sgah2o.org (accessed 4/21/2014). Additionally, the American River Basin Regional Master Plan, resulting from an agreement among “Cooperating Agencies,” including twelve water districts north of the American River, serves to implement elements of a conjunctive water use program envisioned by the Sacramento Water Forum and conceptualized in the American River Water Resources Investigation. This document can be found here: www.sgah2o.org/rwa/programs/arbcup/ (accessed 4/21/2014).

The area immediately south of the American River and north of the Cosumnes River is underlain by the Central Groundwater Basin (GPFEIR p. 6-3). Like the North Groundwater Basin, it has been subject to significant groundwater pumping and groundwater elevation decline. Some water purveyors in the Central Basin rely entirely on groundwater, and some production wells have been affected by groundwater contamination as well as groundwater decline.

The Central Basin is currently managed by the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority, which has also adopted a management plan consistent with the Sacramento Water Forum objectives that addresses groundwater decline and quality in the Central Basin, available at www.scgah2o.org (accessed 4/21/2014).

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA: WATER SUPPLY

Impacts to water supplies would be considered significant if they would:
• Interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.
• Contribute to groundwater pumping to serve project growth such that the average annual sustainable yield of 131,000 acre-feet for the Sacramento North Area Groundwater Basin is exceeded.
• Contribute to groundwater pumping to serve project growth such that the average annual sustainable yield of 273,000 acre-feet for the Sacramento Central Groundwater Basin is exceeded.
• Require the construction of new or the expansion of existing water treatment facilities and pipelines that could potentially cause significant construction level environmental effects.
• Result in a project water demand from proposed land uses that cannot be met by water purveyors’ existing or future projected normal, single dry, and multiple dry year supplies.
• Adversely affect the ability to maintain a sustainable, high quality groundwater resource for users of the Sacramento North and Central Groundwater Basins.

**Impact Discussion: Water Supply**

**Impact:** Land use changes encompassed by the General Plan Mixed Use Alternative were determined to affect seventeen water purveyors: Florin County Water District, Fruitridge Vista Water Company, California American Water Company (CalAm), Golden States Water Company, Tokay Park Water Company, Del Paso Manor Water District, City of Folsom, Carmichael Water District, Citrus Heights Water District, Fair Oaks Water District, Orangevale Water District, San Juan Water District, Rio Linda Water District, Sacramento Suburban Water District, City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 40 (SCWA Zone 40). Four water purveyors, the California American Water Company (CalAm), Florin County Water District, Fruitridge Vista Water Company, the Golden States Water Company and the Tokay Park Water Company, were found to have insufficient water supply to support growth anticipated by the Mixed Use Alternative (GPFEIR pp. 6-29 – 6-44, 6-80 – 6-85), resulting in potentially significant and significant and unavoidable impacts. All of the seventeen would likely require additional infrastructure development to support the Mixed Use Alternative, foreseeably resulting in potentially significant impacts. ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

**Impact:** Impacts to groundwater recharge, further limiting future groundwater supply, were found to be significant and unavoidable due to an existing approved development on groundwater-recharge areas above the Central Groundwater Basin (GPFEIR p. 6-58, Plate WS-5, p.6-59, p. 6-87). ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.
GPFEIR Mitigation: Mitigation Measure WS-1, as adopted in the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan, was found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

WS-1. The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: New development that will generate additional water demand shall not be approved or building permits shall not be issued, if sufficient water supply is not available, as determined by Water Supply Assessment and Written Verification processes (GPFEIR p. 6-53 Control No. 02-GBP-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011, p.12).

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, encompassing water supply impacts (Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to Policy WS-1, as well as all other General Plan policies related to water supply, infrastructure construction and mitigation, and groundwater recharge. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Setting: Sewer Services (Wastewater Transport, Treatment and Disposal Facilities)

Sewer services in unincorporated Sacramento County are provided by the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD), which builds and maintains trunk lines, and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD), which builds and operates the interceptor lines and regional wastewater treatment plant. SRCSD was formed in 1973 to provide a regional wastewater conveyance, treatment, and disposal system for the entire urbanized area of Sacramento County, to eliminate wastewater flows to the American River, to minimize raw sewage overflows to the Sacramento River. The SRCSD replaced 17 separate wastewater treatment plants with a centralized treatment facility, the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP), 8521 Laguna Station Road, in the south part of the County, near the City of Elk Grove. Sewage is routed to the wastewater treatment plant by the SRCSD collections systems from local systems including those owned by SASD and the cities of Sacramento and Folsom. The SRWTP is a high-purity oxygen-activated sludge facility, and is permitted to treat an average dry weather flow (ADWF) of 181 million gallons per day (mgd) and a daily peak wet weather flow of 392 mgd. After secondary treatment and disinfection, a portion of the effluent from the plant is further treated in SRCSD’s Water Reclamation Facility and then used for non-potable purposes, such as landscape irrigation, within select areas of
the City of Elk Grove and the SRWTP. The majority of the treated wastewater is dechlorinated and discharged into the Sacramento River.

SRCSD provides wastewater treatment for more than one million residents within a 435-square mile area within Sacramento County. GPFEIR Plate SE-1 illustrates the existing SRCSD service area, which generally encompasses the Sacramento Metropolitan area, including the cities of Sacramento (portion), Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Rancho Cordova and West Sacramento. The cities of Folsom, Sacramento and West Sacramento are responsible for collection system operation and maintenance within their city limits; SASD is responsible for the local collection system and maintenance in the cities of Citrus Heights, Courtland, Walnut Grove, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, portions of the City of Sacramento, Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center (RCCC), and the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. GPFEIR Plate SE 1 shows the existing SASD service area in Sacramento County.

The 2030 Sacramento County General Plan identifies the Urban Services Boundary (USB) as the ultimate boundary of urban development in the unincorporated County (2030 General Plan, Land Use Element, Figure 1). The USB is intended to be used by urban infrastructure providers for developing very long-range master plans that can be implemented over time as the urbanized area expands within the USB. The Urban Policy Area (UPA) is also identified in the 2030 General Plan as the area expected to receive urban levels of public infrastructure and services within the 20-year planning period of the General Plan. Notably, while several sewer districts’ Master Plans cover the area within the UPA, facilities are generally sized to accommodate growth expected within the USB. The GPFEIR describes four master plans: Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan, the Interceptor Master Plan 2000, the Sacramento Area Sewer District Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan, and the SASD Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan 2006 Update (GPFEIR pp. 5-4 – 5-5).

**Significance Criteria: Sewer Services**

A project is considered to have a significant effect if it would:

- require or result in the construction of new wastewater conveyance or treatment facilities; or
- require or result in the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could potentially cause significant environmental effects.

**Impact Discussion: Sewer Services**

**Impact:** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that the modified General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in a minimum of 38.8 million gallons per day (mgd) (average dry weather flow or ADWF)
that must be accommodated by conveyance facilities and 27.9 mgd that must be accommodated by the treatment plan. The existing flows at the time of adoption were 141 mgd, and permitted flows were 181 mgd. The Mixed Use Alternative would increase existing flows to 168.9 mgd, below the plant capacity, but cumulative growth added by the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento and Rancho Cordova would generate flows up to 267.5 mgd. Such an increase would exceed the facility’s capacity (FEIR p. 5-21 – 5-22), and result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with facility expansion. ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

**GPFEIR Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measures SE-1 and SE-2, as adopted in the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan, were found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

**SE-1.** New development projects which require extension or modification of the trunk or interceptor sewer systems shall be consistent with sewer facility plans and shall participate in established funding mechanisms. The County should discourage development projects that are not consistent with sewer master plans or that rely upon interim sewer facilities, particularly if the costs of those interim facilities may fall on ratepayers. Prior to approval of a specific Commercial Corridor redevelopment project which requires extension or modification of the trunk or interceptor sewer systems, a sewer study and financing mechanism shall be prepared and considered along with the proposed Corridor redevelopment project, in consultation with the Sacramento Area Sewer District (GPFEIR, p. 5-19; Control No. 02-GBP-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011, p.11).

**SE-2.** Extension or modification of trunk or interceptor sewer systems that are required for new developments shall be consistent with sewer facility plans and shall participate in an established funding mechanism. New development that will generate wastewater for treatment at the SRWTP shall not be approved if treatment capacity at the SRWTP is not sufficient to allow treatment and disposal of wastewater in compliance with the SRWTP’s NPDES Permit (GPFEIR pp. 5-19 – 5-20; Control No. 02-GBP-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011, p.11).

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, encompassing sewer services impacts (Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to Policies SE-1 and SE-2, as well as all other General Plan policies related to sewer services and infrastructure construction and mitigation. Accordingly,
ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING – TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

Sacramento County has an established and comprehensive transportation system to serve the diverse travel needs of the County. It includes Federal and State highways, local roads, urban arterials, rural highways and streets, rail and bus transit services, freight rail, port facilities and airports. The transportation system and associated travel patterns are heavily influenced by the presence of downtown Sacramento and the State Capitol on the west side of the County. The County is also strategically located at the confluence of two federal interstate highways serving east-west and north-south travel.

Roadway System. The geographic setting of Sacramento County affected the historical development of the roadway system. The roadway system is focused on downtown Sacramento and is limited by Sacramento River and American River crossings. All of the major interregional roadways radiate in a spoke-like fashion from the hub of downtown Sacramento. Interstate 5 and State Route 99 are generally parallel north-south routes; Interstate 80 and U.S. 50 serve east-west trips. The interstate routes, all of U.S. 50 and most of S.R. 99 are limited-access freeways within Sacramento County.

The arterial system within the County serves local community areas and provides access to the interregional freeway system. It is also utilized for longer-distance intra-county trips. The majority of the arterial system follows a north-south, east-west grid pattern. Exceptions are generally older roadways that originally served long distance trips before they were replaced in function by freeways. For Sacramento County, the American River is a major obstacle to north-south travel. River crossings are limited, particularly east of the City of Sacramento.

The existing major street and highway capacity designations in the County include collectors, rural collectors, arterials, thoroughfares, freeways, and limited-access roadways; they are described and shown on the Existing General Plan Transportation Plan (see GPFEIR, p. 9-2 and Plate TC 1, p. 9-3). The GPFEIR includes additional discussion on passenger and freight transport capacity (GPFEIR, p. 9-4).

Transit. The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) operates 97 bus routes and 37.4 miles of light rail covering a 418 square-mile service area. Buses and light rail run 365 days a year using 76 light rail vehicles, 256 buses powered by compressed natural gas (CNG) and 16 shuttle vans. Buses and light rail operate daily from approximately 4:15 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. Annual ridership totaled 32 million passengers in FY 2007 (most recent data obtained from the RT website, www.sacrt.com/rtfactsheets.stm,
Sacramento County currently has 203.9 miles of existing bikeways, with 1326.3 miles of new bikeways proposed in the 2011 Master Plan. The bikeway network currently includes 72.3 miles of Class I bike paths, 122.2 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 9.4 miles of Class III bike routes; the planned network includes 348.41 miles of Class I, 935.76 miles of Class II, and 42.08 miles of Class III bikeways.

The Sacramento County Bikeway Master Plan, adopted in April, 2011, guides and influences bikeway policies, programs and development standards to make bicycling in Sacramento County more safe, comfortable, convenient, and enjoyable for all bicyclists (available at www.sacdot.com/Pages/BikewayMasterPlan.aspx accessed 4/29/2014). The Bicycle Master Plan complements the Sacramento County General Plan Circulation Element, which includes goals and policies to develop a balanced transportation system for automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. The Plan includes a prioritized list of projects to implement the proposed improvements, as well as provisions for monitoring and maintaining bikeways.

Pedestrian Facilities. Pedestrian facilities vary greatly in Sacramento County, particularly because much of the roadway infrastructure in the unincorporated area was constructed post World War II, when the automobile became the dominant form of personal transportation. Consequently, many roadways lack pedestrian infrastructure or a continuous pedestrian infrastructure. The Sacramento County Pedestrian Master Plan, adopted in November 2007, establishes goals and strategies to increase pedestrian safety and improve walkability in the Sacramento County unincorporated area.

Aviation. Five major airports, 11 general aviation airports, five heliports, one seaplane base, and various minor private airstrips (typically used for agricultural purposes) serve Sacramento County (see GPFEIR pp. 9-9 – 9-10; Table TC-2, p. 9-11). Four of the major airports are the Sacramento County Airport System, owned and operated by Sacramento County: Sacramento International Airport, Mather Airport (formerly Mather Air Force Base), Executive Airport, and Franklin Field. The fifth major airport, McClellan Public Airport, (formerly McClellan Air Force Base), is also owned and operated by Sacramento County, but is not part of the County Airport System.

Sacramento International Airport (SMF) is the major commercial airport for the Sacramento region. The airport is located in the northwest portion of the County, and is
the only airport in the County that provides regularly-scheduled passenger service. It is served by 14 major carriers and one commuter airline, with more than 150 scheduled departures daily. The airport also accommodates cargo and general aviation (private jet aircraft) service. In 2007, over 10.7 million passengers were accommodated. The airport has two parallel runways, each 8,600 feet long. Master planning for airport renovation and expansion is in progress (See Sacramento County Airport System, Planning and Design, http://www.sacramento.aero/scas/about/planning_design/, accessed 4/29/2014).

Rail (passenger and freight). Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) provides light rail passenger rail service to Sacramento County, and Amtrak provides “heavy” rail service. RT Gold and Blue Lines link the northern, eastern, and southern areas in Sacramento County to downtown Sacramento through approximately 37 miles of track. Light rail operates in a mixture of grade-separated and in-street settings. Amtrak operates three lines through Sacramento County: Capitol Corridor, San Joaquins, and the California Zephyr. The Capitol Corridor runs from Auburn through Sacramento to San Jose; the San Joaquins run from both Oakland to Bakersfield and from Sacramento to Bakersfield, and the California Zephyr runs from San Francisco through Sacramento to Chicago, Illinois.

The Union Pacific Railroad (UP) provides rail freight services to Sacramento County. UP operates several mainlines in the County, as well as numerous sidings and switching lines. The major east-west line extends to the San Francisco Bay area to the west, and continues eastward into Placer County to the J. R. Davis Classification Yard in Roseville. The line continues from Roseville across the Sierra, providing transcontinental service. To the north, UP operates a mainline through northern California to the Pacific Northwest. To the south, UP operates two mainlines to Stockton, with continuation to Southern California and the Southwest.

Port. The port of Sacramento is located on the west side of the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River and the Deep Water Ship Channel provide navigable waterways to the Bay Area and the Pacific Ocean. The port is within Yolo County, but Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento are members of the Port Authority that operates the facility. The port is mainly used to transport bulk agricultural commodities and large, bulky products.

**Significance Criteria: Transportation and Circulation**

Roadway Segments

A project is considered to have a significant effect on roadway segments if it would:

1. Result in a roadway operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS “D” for rural areas and LOS “E” for urban areas) to deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS; or
2. Increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by more than 0.05 on a roadway that is operating at an unacceptable LOS without the project.

**Freeway System**

For the freeway system, a significant impact occurs when:

1. An increase in traffic volumes results in the traffic operations of the freeway mixed-flow lanes deteriorating from LOS “E” or better to LOS “F.”
2. Any increase in traffic volumes on freeway mixed flow lanes where unacceptable LOS “F” conditions exist without the project or alternative.

**Transit**

A significant impact to the transit system occurs when:

1. Project-generated ridership, when added to existing or future ridership, exceeds available or planned system capacity.
2. The project is inconsistent with General Plan principles for transit-supportive development.
3. An adequate and appropriate level of transit services is not available in a timely manner to serve new development.

**IMPACT DISCUSSION: TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

**Impact (Roadway segments, freeway system):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that the modified General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in increased traffic volumes on many roadway segments throughout unincorporated Sacramento County and other jurisdictions, and would result in changes in roadway operating conditions that exceed the applicable standards of significance. These increased traffic volumes were found to adversely affect access and circulation throughout the County. Despite the improvements in mobility that could be accomplished with mitigation measures, it was considered infeasible to fully mitigate the impacts of the Alternative on roadways because funding for those improvements may be unavailable or delayed. By increasing infill and redevelopment, the Mixed-Use Alternative was found to have greatest potential to reduce roadway impacts on a regional basis but would increase roadway impacts in localized areas. Accordingly, remaining impacts on roadway levels of service were found to be significant and unavoidable. (GPFEIR pp. 11-73 – 11-74; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 18-21, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

GPFEIR mitigation measures were found to reduce level-of-service impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels. These measures would apply to development permitted by the ZCU; private projects would also be required to provide or fund transportation.
facilities as reasonably related to specific project impacts. The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR.

**GPFEIR Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measures TC-1 through TC-5, as adopted in the Traffic and Circulation Element of the General Plan, were found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

**TC-1.** The Sacramento County Transportation Plan diagram shall be amended to designate the following roadways as six lane thoroughfares in the cumulative condition:

A. White Rock Road (between Grant Line Road and Scott Road North)
B. Kiefer Boulevard (between Excelsior Road and Bradshaw Road)
C. Excelsior Road (between Gerber Road and Jackson Road) (GPFEIR p. 9-57).

**TC-2.** The following policies shall be added to the General Plan:

A. Replace Policy CI-19 (now Policy Number CI-25) with the following – The County shall develop right-of-way acquisition guidelines for the implementation of transit services shown on the Transportation Plan.
B. Public Facilities Financing Plans shall incorporate capital and operating costs for transit. Infrastructure Master Plans shall include transit planning.
C. Plan and implement intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategies within the County’s high-demand travel corridors and support efforts to deploy ITS strategies on a regional level.
D. The County shall plan and prioritize the implementation of intersection improvements, where feasible, in corridors identified as congested (GPFEIR pp. 9-57 to 9-58).

**TC-3.** The County shall adopt a smart-growth program that will facilitate the expansion of walkways, bikeways, and transit services and decreases in vehicle miles traveled. This requirement may be met by adopting the proposed Smart Growth Streets program described in this chapter, or by including a policy within the General Plan requiring adoption of a smart-growth program consisting of the following minimum elements:

A. A policy focusing on overall mobility to supplement the existing vehicular mobility standards.
B. A policy or set of policies that allow enhancements to non-auto travel modes as mitigation pursuant to the policy described in TC-3.A.
C. Replacement or alteration of the minimum parking standards with standards that reflect and accommodate average use for the region, or
other method that results in overall reductions in per-project parking requirements (GPFEIR p. 9-58).

TC-4. The following policy shall be added to the General Plan:

A. Infill projects that are consistent with the County’s definition of a Quality Infill Project may participate in the County’s Infill/Urban Tree Mitigation Program. The Tree Mitigation Infill Policy is as follows: Impacts to native trees designated for removal shall be calculated and mitigated based on canopy area coverage. Canopy replacement may utilize any tree species that is listed on the Tree Coordinator’s list of recommended trees for parking lot shade. For measurement purposes, replacement tree canopy shall be calculated in the same manner as the parking lot shade requirements of Section 330-94 of the Sacramento County Zoning Code, using the ultimate canopy growth as specified on the Tree Coordinator’s Tree Species Specifications. Tree canopy replacement shall, ideally, occur on site. In the event the physical constraints of the site preclude the additional replacement mitigation on-site, the following options may be utilized in coordination with the County Tree Coordinator and Mitigation Program:

a. Planting in adjacent landscape/ corridor areas;

b. Planting within local parks;

c. Other plantings that may otherwise be arranged in the neighborhood or community;

d. Participation in County programs including but not limited to payment of in lieu fees for use in tree care, preservation and maintenance programs, and other similar programs to the satisfaction of the County Tree Coordinator (GPFEIR pp. 9-58 to 9-59).

TC-5. The following policies of the General Plan shall be modified:

A. Modify CI-1 as follows: Provide complete streets with access to a diversity of safe and efficient travel modes for all urban and suburban land uses within Sacramento County except within certain established neighborhoods where particular amenities (such as sidewalks) are not desired.

B. Modify CI-3 as follows: Travel modes shall be interconnected to form an integrated, coordinated and balanced multi-modal transportation system, planned and developed consistent with the land uses to be served.

---

4 The General Plan Update’s Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations revised the GPFEIR mitigation measures, indicating the changes in boldface. Only the final adopted text is shown here.
C. Modify CI-21 (now Policy Number CI-32) as follows: Develop a comprehensive, safe, convenient and accessible bicycle and pedestrian system that serves and connects the County's employment, commercial, recreational, educational, social services, housing and other transportation modes.

D. Modify LU-28 (now Policy LU-26) as follows: When planning for new development in new communities, the features below shall be incorporated for their public health benefits and ability to encourage more active lifestyles, unless environmental constraints make this infeasible. In existing communities, the features below shall be considered, as appropriate and feasible.

- Where appropriate, compact, mixed use development and a balance of land uses so that everyday needs are within walking distance, including schools, parks, jobs, retail and grocery stores.
- Streets, paths and public transportation that connect multiple destinations and provide for alternatives to the automobile.
- Wide sidewalks, shorter blocks, well-marked crosswalks, on-street parking, shaded streets and traffic-calming measures to encourage pedestrian activity.
- Walkable commercial areas with features that may include doors and windows fronting on the street, street furniture, pedestrian-scale lighting, and served by transit when feasible.

E. Modify LU-39 (now Policy LU-37) as follows: Provide and support development of pedestrian and bicycle connections between transit stations and nearby residential, commercial, employment or civic uses by eliminating physical barriers and providing linking facilities, such as pedestrian overcrossings, trails, wide sidewalks and safe street crossings.

F. Modify LU-72 (now Policy LU-68) as follows: Give the highest priority for public funding to projects that facilitate infill, reuse, redevelopment and rehabilitation, mixed use development, and that will result in per-person vehicle miles traveled lower than the County average, and the lowest priority for projects that do not comply with public facilities Master Plan phasing sequences (GPFEIR pp. 9-59 to 9-60, 9-93; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 21-22, 33-37).

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, encompassing traffic and circulation impacts (Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, 11/9/2011, pp. 18-22).
The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project. Development under the ZCU would be subject to numerous Circulation Element policies, as well as all other General Plan policies related to traffic, circulation, infrastructure construction and associated mitigation. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**Impact (Transit):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that the modified General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in an increased demand for transit services. To accommodate new development, RT would need to increase frequency on current transit (bus and light rail) routes, extend transit routes and add new transit routes. New development would also require additional buses and light rail vehicles, which would in turn require additional maintenance facilities and equipment. Existing and future transit routes would require additional stations, stops and park-and-ride lots. Funding for these vehicles and facilities is not guaranteed, resulting in insufficient transit service and/or delays in improving service.

Mitigation Measure TC-6 was found to reduce impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels; ZCU adoption would not change these impacts. The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to Mitigation Measure TC-6, as well as all other General Plan policies related to transit facilities and operations; private projects would also be required to provide or fund transit facilities as reasonably related to specific project impacts. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR.

**GPFEIR Mitigation Measure:** Mitigation Measure TC-6, as adopted in the Traffic and Circulation Element of the General Plan, was found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

TC-6. The following policy language shall be added to the General Plan:

A. The County shall work with Regional Transit to establish and implement development guidelines to maximize the ability of new development to support planned transit services.

B. The County shall adopt development guidelines to ensure that new development and redevelopment occurs with an orientation to travel patterns that are conducive to transit service. This will include concentration of development in centers and along linear corridors such that trip origins and destinations are concentrated near transit services.
C. The County shall collaborate with transit providers to promote the phased implementation of transit services to all growth areas as development occurs.

D. The County shall promote transit-supportive programs in new development, including employer-based trip-reduction programs (employer incentives to use transit or non-motorized modes), “guaranteed ride home” for commute trips, and car-share or bike-share programs.

E. The County shall implement paid parking in the densest commercial areas, whenever feasible.

F. In BRT and Feeder Line transit corridors that are anticipated to be congested in the future, the County shall implement all feasible measures to minimize the effects of congestion on transit travel times.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, encompassing traffic and circulation impacts (Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, 11/9/2011, pp. 18-22). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project. Development under the ZCU would be subject to numerous Circulation Element policies, as well as all other General Plan policies related to traffic, circulation, infrastructure construction and associated mitigation. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

AIR QUALITY

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: AIR QUALITY**

**Climate and Atmospheric Conditions.** The Project Area encompasses the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, California. Sacramento County is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which includes Sacramento, Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, and parts of Solano and Placer counties. The SVAB is bounded on the west by the Coast Ranges and on the north and east by the Cascade Range and Sierra Nevada. The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin lies to the south.

The SVAB has a Mediterranean climate characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, rainy winters. During the winter, the North Pacific storm track intermittently dominates valley weather, and fair weather alternates with periods of extensive clouds and precipitation. Also characteristic of winter weather in the valley are periods of dense and persistent low-level fog, which is most prevalent between storms. The frequency and persistence of heavy fog in the valley diminishes with the approach of spring. The average yearly temperature range for the Sacramento Valley is between 40° and 95° Fahrenheit (F), with summer high temperatures often exceeding 90°F and winter low

Prevailing winds in the Sacramento Valley are generally from the southwest due to marine breezes flowing through the Carquinez Strait, which is the major corridor for air moving into the Sacramento Valley from the west. Incoming airflow strength varies daily with a pronounced diurnal cycle. Influx strength is weakest in the morning and increases in the evening hours. Associated with the influx of air through the Carquinez Strait is the Schultz Eddy, formed when mountains on the valley’s western side divert incoming marine air. The eddy contributes to a low-level southerly jet between 500 and 1,000 feet above the surface that is capable of speeds in excess of 35 miles per hour (mph). This jet is important for air quality in the Sacramento Valley because of its ability to transport air pollutants over large distances.

The SVAB’s climate and topography contribute to the formation and transport of photochemical pollutants throughout the region. The region experiences temperature inversions that limit atmospheric mixing and trap pollutants; high pollutant concentrations result near the ground surface. Generally, the lower the inversion base height from the ground and the greater the temperature increase from base to top, the more pronounced the inhibiting effect of the inversion will be on pollutant dispersion. Consequently, the highest concentrations of photochemical pollutants occur from late spring to early fall when photochemical reactions are greatest because of intensifying sunlight and lowering altitude of daytime inversion layers. Surface inversions (those at altitudes of 0 to 500 feet above sea level) are most frequent during winter, and subsidence inversions (those at 1,000 to 2,000 feet above sea level) are most common in the summer.

GPFEIR Table AQ-1 lists emission sources in the County; GPFEIR Table AQ-2 shows the ambient air quality standards that apply in California; GPFEIR Table AQ-3 shows ambient air-quality monitoring data measured at Sacramento monitoring stations for 2006, 2007 and 2008. GPFEIR Table AQ-4 lists state and federal attainment designations for Sacramento County.

**Sensitive Receptors.** The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) defines sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants or may experience adverse effects from unhealthful concentrations of air pollutants. Hospitals and clinics, schools, elderly housing and convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. These types of sensitive receptors are located throughout the Project area.
SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA: AIR QUALITY

An impact related to air quality is considered significant if it would:

1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan;
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
4. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.
5. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

The State CEQA Guidelines further state that significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the above determinations. Accordingly, the GPFEIR assessed impacts to air quality based on the SMAQMD’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County* (Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, December 2009). The SMAQMD’s thresholds of significance for construction- and operation-related emissions are shown in GPFEIR Table AQ-1.

**GPFEIR Table AQ-1**
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Thresholds of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Ozone precursor emissions (pounds per day)</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction (short-term)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>CAAQS&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational (long-term)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>CAAQS&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> A project that may cause an exceedance of a State air quality standard, or may make a substantial contribution to an existing exceedance of an air quality standard will have a significant adverse air quality impact. “Substantial” is defined as making measurably worse, which is 5 percent or more of an existing exceedance of a State ambient air quality standard.


The SMAQMD *Recommended Protocol for Evaluating the Location of Sensitive Land Uses Adjacent to Major Roadways* provides guidance for assessing significant impacts from exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs) from mobile sources. The Protocol does not establish a threshold of significance for mobile sources, but indicates an evaluation...
criterion of 296 cases of cancer per million, which was selected as that level of increased individual risk corresponding to a 70 percent reduction from the highest risk calculated at 50 feet (SMAQMD 2009). At this level, a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) is recommended. Because the SMAQMD does not provide a threshold of significance for evaluating health risks from mobile sources, a significance threshold of a lifetime probability of contracting cancer of greater than 10 in one million was used in the GPFEIR analysis.

For assessing significant impacts from construction-related emissions of particulate matter, the SMAQMD has established a screening level of 15 acres of actively disturbed area; projects that exceed that size will result in significant impacts. Whether above or below the 15-acre level, SMAQMD recommends the mitigation measures published in the December 2009 Guide To Air Quality Assessment (under the heading Basic Construction Emission Control Practices).

**Impact Discussion: Air Quality**

**Impact (Generation of on-road mobile source criteria pollutant emissions in excess of SMAQMD thresholds):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that adoption of the General Plan Update would result in emissions that exceed SMAQMD significance thresholds. Even with the preparation of air quality management plans (AQMPs) on a project-level basis and the County’s General Plan policies aimed at promoting smart growth, reducing vehicle trips and trip lengths, and improving air quality, it was anticipated that emissions from development anticipated under the Project would still exceed SMAQMD threshold levels. Consequently, impacts resulting from on-road vehicle emissions was determined to be significant and unavoidable ((GPFEIR pp. 11-77 – 11-78; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 23, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change this impact.

General Plan Policies LU-1, AQ-12 through AQ-21, and subsequent implementation measures, intended to reduce air pollutants, as well as federal and state air pollution regulations would apply to development permitted by the ZCU (GPFEIR 11-16 -11-30) and was found to constitute all feasible mitigation. The ZCU, by itself, does not promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**Impact (Generation of stationary, area, and off-road criteria pollutant emissions in excess of SMAQMD thresholds):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that adoption of the General Plan Update would result in emissions that exceed SMAQMD significance thresholds. Even with the
preparation of air quality management plans (AQMPs) on a project-level basis and the County’s General Plan policies aimed at promoting smart growth, reducing vehicle trips and trip lengths, and improving air quality, it was anticipated that emissions from development anticipated under the Project would still exceed SMAQMD threshold levels. Consequently, this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable ((GPFEIR p. 11-113; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 24, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change this impact.

General Plan Policies LU-28, LU-29, LU-30, AQ-12, AQ-13, AQ-14, AQ-16, AQ-17, AQ-18, AQ-20, AQ-21, and AQ-22, and subsequent implementation measures, intended to reduce air pollutants from stationary sources, as well as federal and state air pollution regulations, would apply to development permitted by the ZCU (GPFEIR pp. 11-16 - 11-30) and was found to constitute all feasible mitigation. The ZCU, by itself, does not promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**Impact (Elevated Health Risks for Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Roadway Emissions):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that adoption of the General Plan Update would result in adverse health risks, including cancer, to sensitive receptors from roadway emissions. Specifically, modeling performed for the GPFEIR indicated that potential cancer risks to sensitive receptors would vary between 13 and 121 cancers per million individuals, exceeding the SMAQMD threshold of 10 per million for major roadways (GPFEIR p. 11-114).

Although General Plan policy would require buffers between sensitive receptors and pollution or odor sources, it was anticipated that sensitive receptors would still be subject to significant and unavoidable impacts. ((GPFEIR p. 11-114; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 24, 33-37).

General Plan Policy AQ-3, and subsequent implementation measures for providing buffers to protect sensitive receptors from sources of air pollution, as well as federal and state air pollution regulations, would apply to development permitted by the ZCU (GPFEIR p. 11-16 - 11-30, 11-114), and was found to constitute all feasible mitigation. The ZCU, by itself, does not promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.
Impact (Elevated Health Risks for Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Other Emission Sources): The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that adoption of the General Plan Update would result in adverse health risks, including cancer, to sensitive receptors from other emission sources, such as freeways, distribution centers, ports, refineries, chrome-plating facilities, dry cleaners, gasoline stations and other common sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs)(GPFEIR p. 11-115).

Although General Plan policy would require buffers between sensitive receptors and pollution or odor sources, it was anticipated that sensitive receptors would still be subject to significant and unavoidable impacts (GPFEIR p. 11-115; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 25, 33-37).

General Plan Policy AQ-3, and subsequent implementation measures for providing buffers to protect sensitive receptors from sources of air pollution, as well as federal and state air pollution regulations, would apply to development permitted by the ZCU (GPFEIR p. 11-16 - 11-30, 11-115), and was found to constitute all feasible mitigation. The ZCU, by itself, does not promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES*

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Prehistory: The Sacramento area has a long prehistoric association. Indigenous people populated the Sacramento Valley region for thousands of years prior to the influx of Euro-American settlers in the mid-1800s. Archaeological evidence confirms that the initial occupation of California occurred prior to 8,000 years ago (Moratto 1984). The earliest inhabitants were apparently transient hunters and gatherers who exploited the various ecological zones on a seasonal rotation. As time progressed, more permanent settlements were established and food collecting became intensive, involving storage of food (Bennyhoff 1977:11).

The chronological patterns of the prehistory of Sacramento County are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Archaeological Unit</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaic 6,000 B.C.–A.D. 1,000</td>
<td>Windmiller</td>
<td>Social stratification inferred from burials; distant trade; flaked stone, bone, ground stone, baked clay, and shell items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 B.C.–500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See GPFEIR and associated background reports for detailed Cultural Resources environmental setting (GPFEIR pp. 15-1 - 15-15) and references.
Ethnographic records (from missions and other documents) show that the groups that inhabited Sacramento County are the Nisenan, or Southern Maidu, and the Plains Miwok, a subgroup of the Eastern Miwok. The Nisenan generally occupied the areas north of the American River and the Plains Miwok occupied the areas south of it. The “tribelet” was the basic political unit for both ethnic groups; a tribelet consisted of one primary and several satellite villages under the authority of a “headman.” Permanent villages were situated on elevated ground adjacent to streams or above marshy flood plains. Nisenan sites include villages, seasonal camps, quarries, ceremonial grounds, trading sites, fishing stations, cemeteries, and river crossings (Wilson and Towne 1978:389).

In the middle to late 1800s, with the arrival of trappers, settlers, and miners, the Nisenan and the Plains Miwok were displaced from their land, killed, and fell victim to various epidemics. This greatly reduced the population, and resulted in the near-destruction of their languages and cultures.

Historical Period. Early Spanish explorers and the Franciscan and Jesuit missionaries who followed them were the first Europeans to settle in coastal northern California (Hoover et al. 1990). Established settlement of the Sacramento area did not begin until the late 1830s and early 1840s, when individuals such as Sutter and Jared Sheldon obtained land grants from the Mexican government, usually in exchange for an agreement to protect Mexican interests in the more remote interior regions (Beck and Haase 1974, Thompson and West 1880). As a result of the Mexican War (1847-1848), California became part of the territory of the United States, and with the discovery of gold in 1848, settlers flooded into the Sacramento region. As population increased and easily-found gold decreased, newcomers turned to agriculture and other vocations. Raising grain, livestock, and produce to sell to the thousands of miners heading to the gold fields proved a profitable venture. These events hastened the settlement of the area and the development of Sacramento as an economic and transportation center. The designation of Sacramento as the state capital in 1854 resulted in the area’s increase in sociopolitical importance (GPFEIR pp. 15-1- 15-8).

Archival research performed for the 2030 General Plan Update identified 627 previously-recorded prehistoric sites and 607 previously-recorded historical sites within the County (GPFEIR p. 15-10). Both prehistoric and historic sites are found in greater concentration along waterways, which supplied year-round resources to prehistoric and historic-period inhabitants. Areas that are likely or extremely likely to contain prehistoric sites include the Cosumnes River area, the American River area, and the Delta and
Sacramento River areas. Historic sites tend to be concentrated in areas still inhabited such as the City of Sacramento, City of Folsom, the Delta, along old travel routes like the Jackson Highway, Central California Traction Railroad, and Southern Pacific Railroad routes and along river and stream beds (GPFEIR, pp. 15-8 – 15-9, Plate CR 1, p. 15-9).

Paleontological Resources. The University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database identifies five localities in Sacramento County with known Pleistocene-epoch\(^6\) formations containing vertebrate fossils: the Riverbank formation at Arco Arena, along Chicken Ranch Slough near Howe Avenue and Arden Way, the Teichert Gravel Pit, the Davis Gravel Pit, and Ehrhardt Avenue near the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (GPFEIR p. 15-13). Fossils recovered from these sites are considered to be Rancholabrean (late Pleistocene) in age, and radiometric dating of vertebrate fossils from the Teichert and Davis sites indicated ages of approximately 103,000 + 6,000 years. Representative species from these sites comprise large and small mammals, including mammoths, bison, dire wolf, ground sloths, camels, pack rats and smooth-toothed gophers. Other vertebrate fossils recovered come from the bird, fish and reptile taxonomic classes. Because of their documented richness and diversity, Sacramento County’s Pleistocene formations are considered sensitive for paleontological resources (GPFEIR p. 15-13).

Other formations of different epochs and periods found in Sacramento County have been known to contain paleontological resources in other jurisdictions outside the County. For example, the Mehrten Formation, a Miocene-Pliocene aged formation, has produced significant fossil vertebrates at locations outside the County. Similarly, the Laguna Formation (Pliocene aged formation) has produced significant fossil remains at many localities within the Central Valley (e.g., Hay 1927; Piper et al. 1939) and is considered to have high sensitivity (GPFEIR p. 15-14 – 15-15). Accordingly, these formations cannot be ruled out for paleontological resources.

**Significance Criteria: Cultural Resources**

In order for a cultural resource to be considered a “historic property” under National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria, it must be demonstrated that the resource possesses *integrity* of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and must meet at least one of the following four Section 106 criteria (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2000), as listed in 36 CFR 60.4:

(a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

\(^6\) 1.6 – 0.011 millions of years before present day. See GPFEIR Plate CR-2, p. 15-14.
(b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
(c) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of
construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic
values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose
components may lack individual distinction; or
(d) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in
prehistory or history.

The criteria for listing resources on the California Register of Historical Resources
(CRHR) were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established
criteria developed for listing on the NRHP, enumerated above, and require similar
protection to what NHPA Section 106 mandates for historic properties. California Public
Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1(c)(1-4) states that a resource is considered
historically significant if it meets at least one of the following criteria:

(1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the
broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
(2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of
installation, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or
possesses high artistic values; or
(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or
history.

Under CEQA, if an archaeological site is not a significant “historical resource” but meets
the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” as defined in PRC Section 21083.2,
then it should be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section. A unique
archaeological resource is defined as follows:

An archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly
demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there
is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

(1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research
questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that
information.
(2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type
or the best available example of its type.
(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important
prehistoric or historic event or person.
Resources that neither meet any of these criteria for listing on the NRHP or CRHR, nor qualify as a “unique archaeological resource” under CEQA (PRC Section 21083.2) are viewed as not significant. Under CEQA, “A non-unique archaeological resource need be given no further consideration, other than the simple recording of its existence by the lead agency if it so elects” (PRC Section 21083.2(h)).

Impacts to significant cultural resources (“historic properties” under NHPA and “historical resources” under CEQA) that affect the characteristics of any resource that qualify it for the NRHP or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed on or eligible for listing on the CRHR are considered a significant effect on the environment. Impacts to significant cultural resources from a proposed project are thus considered significant if the project physically destroys or damages all or part of a resource, changes the character of the use of the resource or physical feature within the setting of the resource which contribute to its significance or introduces visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of significant features of the resource.

**Significance Criteria: Paleontological Resources**

Thresholds for determining the significance of impacts related to paleontological resources are established from the State CEQA Guidelines and professional standards. Professional standards are from the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP).

The CEQA Guidelines consider a project to have a significant impact on paleontological resources if it will:

- Directly result in the destruction of a unique paleontological resource; or
- Indirectly result in the destruction of a unique paleontological resource

The SVP designates three categories of sensitivity for paleontological resources- high, low, and undetermined:

- **High sensitivity**: Areas where fossils have been previously found are considered to have a high sensitivity and a high potential to produce fossils. In areas of high sensitivity that are likely to yield unique paleontological resources, full-time monitoring is typically recommended during any project ground disturbance.

- **Low sensitivity**: Areas that are not sedimentary in origin and that have not been known to produce fossils in the past typically are considered to have low sensitivity and monitoring is usually not needed during project construction.

- **Undetermined sensitivity**: Areas or rock formations that have not had any previous paleontological resource surveys or fossil finds are considered undetermined until surveys and mapping are performed to determine their
sensitivity. After reconnaissance surveys, observation of exposed cuts, and possibly subsurface testing, a qualified paleontologist can determine whether the area should be categorized as having a high or low sensitivity. In keeping with the significance criteria of the SVP (1995), all vertebrate fossils are generally categorized as having potential significance based on their scientific value.

**IMPACT DISCUSSION: CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Impact (Development Impacts to Important Archeological Resources):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that implementation of the 2030 General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in direct and indirect impacts to important archaeological resources. The Mixed-Use Alternative eliminated some sensitive areas from urban growth, and thus avoided some impacts to yet-undiscovered archeological resources. However, because such resources have not been fully surveyed or documented through the County, future development proposals could result in adverse impacts. Mitigation Measure CR-1 added protective polices to the Conservation Element, but these policies would only lessen, not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to archeological resources were found significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, p.27, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

**GPFEIR Mitigation Measure:** Mitigation Measure CR-1, as adopted in the Conservation Element, Cultural Resources, was found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

CR-1. The following policies shall be added to the Cultural Resources chapter of the Conservation Element:

A. County Planning staff shall take historical and cultural resources into consideration when conducting planning studies and documents in preparation of, including but not limited to, area plans, corridor plans, community plans, and specific plans.

B. When conducting planning studies, County Planning staff, shall encourage the adaptive reuse of historic resources when the original use is no longer feasible or allowed under proposed area planning efforts.

C. County-owned historic and cultural resources shall be preserved and maintained, such that modifications, alterations, and rehabilitations
are conducted in a manner that is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

D. The County shall facilitate and promote the development of a Cultural Resources Tourism program within the County as a tool to preserve important cultural resources and in order to encourage economic development of resources within the County.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, finding that impacts to important archeological resources would be significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32; Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011, pp. 27-28). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to the Conservation Element policies iterated above, as well as all other General Plan policies related to archeological resources protection. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**Impact (Development Impacts to Important Historical/Structural Resources):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that implementation of the 2030 General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in direct and indirect impacts to important historical/structural (architectural) resources. The Mixed-Use Alternative eliminated some sensitive areas from urban growth, and thus avoided some impacts to historical resources; however, future development proposals could still result in adverse impacts to undiscovered resources. Mitigation Measure CR-1, above, added protective polices to the Conservation Element, but these policies would only lessen, not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to historical/structural resources were found significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 27-28, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change these impacts. ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, finding that impacts to important historical/structural resources would be significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32; Control No. 02-GPB-0105, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, November 9, 2011, p. 28, 33-37). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to the Conservation Element policies iterated above, as well as all other General Plan policies related to historical and structural/architectural
resource protection. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**Impact (Development Impacts to Important Cultural Resources):** The GPFEIR and the project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations noted that implementation of the 2030 General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative would result in direct and indirect impacts to important cultural resources. The Mixed-Use Alternative eliminated some sensitive areas from urban growth, and thus avoided some impacts to cultural resources; however, future development proposals could still result in adverse impacts to both known and undiscovered resources. Mitigation Measure CR-1, above, added protective polices to the Conservation Element and was considered all feasible mitigation, since the policies would only lessen, not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to cultural resources were found significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32 -15-33; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 28-29, 33-37). ZCU adoption would not change these impacts.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, finding that impacts to important historical/structural resources would be significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR pp. 15-32 -15-33; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, p.29, 33-37). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required. Development under the ZCU would be subject to the Conservation Element policies iterated above, as well as all other General Plan policies related to historical and structural/architectural resource protection.

**Impact (Development Impacts to Paleontological Resources):** The project’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations observed that impacts to paleontological resources had not been addressed in the GPFEIR and noted that implementation of the 2030 General Plan/Mixed Use Alternative could result in direct and indirect impacts to important resources. The Mixed-Use Alternative eliminated some sensitive areas from urban growth, and thus avoided some impacts to paleontological resources; however, future development proposals could still result in adverse impacts to both known and undiscovered resources. Mitigation Measure CR-2 added protective polices to the Conservation Element and was considered all feasible mitigation, since the policies would only lessen, not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to paleontological resources were found to be significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-33 -15-34; Control No. 02-GPB-0105

**Mitigation Measure:** Mitigation Measure CR-2, as adopted in the Conservation Element, Cultural Resources, was found to reduce anticipated impacts substantially, but not to less-than-significant levels:

CR-1. The General Plan shall add an additional section under the “Cultural Resources” chapter of the Conservation Element entitled “Paleontological Resources” that provides background on Paleontological Resources in general and specifically within the County. The following policies shall be added to the Paleontological Resources section of the Cultural Resources chapter of the Conservation Element:

A. As a condition of approval for discretionary projects, require appropriate mitigation to reduce potential impacts where development could adversely affect paleontological resources.

B. Projects within areas known to be sensitive for paleontological resources should be monitored to ensure proper treatment of resources and to ensure crews follow proper reporting, safeguards and procedures.

C. Require that a certified geologist or paleoresources consultant determine appropriate protection measures when resources are discovered during the course of development and land altering activities (GPFEIR pp. 15-33 – 15-34).

A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the 2030 General Plan Update, finding that impacts to important paleontological resources would be significant and unavoidable (GPFEIR p. 15-32 -15-33; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 29-30, 33-37). The ZCU, by itself, does not change zoning, or promote or authorize any particular project, and would not permit development exceeding General Plan densities. Development under the ZCU would be subject to the Conservation Element policies iterated above, as well as all other General Plan policies related to paleontological resource protection. Accordingly, ZCU adoption would not result in impacts greater than those identified in the GPFEIR. No additional mitigation measures are required.

**REQUESTS/REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS AGENCIES**

None requested.
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES

None recommended.

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Catherine Hack
Division Manager: Tricia Stevens
Project Leader: Christine Kudija, J.D., AICP (Willdan contractor)
Office Manager:
Office Assistant: Justin Maulit
Key Changes to Sacramento County Zoning Code
### A. General Formatting Revisions

1. Reorganize the Zoning Code (ZC) and incorporate misplaced sections into the use table and use standards (e.g., service stations and wineries).

2. Consolidate many of the common development standards in one location (e.g., fencing and landscaping requirements).

3. Consolidate use tables into a single use table (Table 3.1). Accessory uses are set forth in Table 3.2, and temporary uses are set forth in Table 3.3.

4. The addition of “Use Standards” replaces the old footnotes and consolidates many of the general standards located throughout the ZC, and provides a more complete list of standards applicable for each of those uses listed in the use table.

5. Collapse many uses into general categories in the use table (e.g., major/minor auto repair and general business services). Definitions provided to help distinguish those uses that fall within a category.

6. Phase out the Auto Commercial Zone (AC), Highway Travel Commercial Zone (TC) and Shopping Center Zone (SC) by relocating them to ZC Title IV (Interim Zones). These zones will not be listed in the use table, but will be provided with all of the same uses and rights granted by the current ZC.

7. Organize the chapters so that relevant section and subsection headings are referenced at the top of each page.

8. Change the name of Industrial Reserve (IR) zoning to “Interim Agricultural Reserve” zoning.

9. Change the name of Limited Commercial (LC) zoning to “Light Commercial” zoning.
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#### B. Improvements to the Entitlement Process

1. Revise hearing authority hierarchy for some entitlements to reduce cost and decrease administrative processing time.
2. Place more emphasis and reliance on the design review process.
3. Provide more opportunities for shared and reduced parking.
4. Reduce many of the minimum parking requirements consistent with what other jurisdictions require.
5. Provide for a Minor Use Permit for non-controversial items.

#### C. Implementation of General Plan Policies

1. Provide additional density bonuses (Land Use Element).
2. Provide opportunities for mixed-use development with new zones (Land Use Element).
3. Simplify and encourage the construction of accessory dwellings (Housing Element).
4. Promote sustainability through Low Impact Development (LID) standards, reduced parking, and greater reliance on transit (Air Quality Element).
5. Require street tree plantings in residential neighborhoods (Conservation Element).
7. Provide regulations for residential clustering (Open Space Element).
8. Provide for commercial-type land uses in AG zones to support agriculture (Agricultural Element).
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#### D. Revisions to Non-Conforming Uses (Chapter 1)

1. Add provisions for existing businesses that sell alcohol per recent ZC amendment (Section 1.9.3.G).
2. Add provisions for existing fences (Section 1.9.6).
3. Provide clarification to help determine the replacement cost for non-conforming structures—more consistent with California Building Code (CBC) language (Section 1.9.4.A).
4. Provide ability to expand non-conforming structures if the expansion itself (e.g., additional bedroom) is consistent with current zoning regulations, including setbacks (Section 1.9.4.B).
5. Allow for construction of a duplex on a legally created non-conforming RD-10 zoned lot with Design Review, rather than a Variance (Section 1.9.2.H).

#### E. Revisions to the Land Use Table (Chapter 3)

1. Revisions to the hearing authorities for certain uses as follows:
   - Hearing authority change from Board of Supervisors to Planning Commission for the following uses: service stations, convenience markets with extended hours, fortune teller, surface mining, driving range.
   - Hearing authority change from Planning Commission to Zoning Administrator for the following uses: agricultural supplies/services, processing of agricultural products, churches, private social center, lodge/fraternal hall, private school, small-scale office uses in RD zones, freestanding ATMs, wholesale distributor’s facility, kennel, vet hospital, bed & breakfast, drive-up windows, video arcade, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, RV/boat storage, private schools, borrow mining operations.
   - Hearing authority change from Zoning Administrator to Minor (administrative) Use Permit: farmworker housing (in excess of State allowance), residential care/residential child care, private boat dock, mobile home, urban beekeeping, gas/oil well in AG zones, armored car service, auto rental agency, incidental AG Uses (small animal; e.g., chickens) on small lots.
2. Provide a Minor (administrative) Use Permit process required for the following uses: tattoo shops, check cashing, tanning, massage parlors, pawn shops, thrift stores, tobacco shops, residential front-yard fences/walls, small-scale retail/services in MB/BP zones.

3. Allow congregate care facilities by right in the MF zones.

4. Allow single family by right in the IR zone.

5. Provide general use categories such as Major/Minor Automotive Repair, General Business Services, General Personal Services, General Retail Sales, and General Repair Services. See definitions (Chapter 7) to identify examples of typical uses.

6. Require a Use Permit by the Planning Commission if cargo containers are proposed for use as storage structures in conjunction with a permitted mini-storage use (Section 3.8.3.B). Also, allow for the use of cargo containers as an accessory use, and include use standards (Section 3.9.3.T).

7. Distinguish between small and large family day care homes, and provide performance standards for large family day care, and if not met, a Minor Use Permit is required (Section 3.5.1.F).

8. In the case of a mobile home as an accessory dwelling for persons in need of care and supervision, allow for the Planning Director to administratively extend the terms of the Use Permit to other individuals in need of care by an occupant of the other dwelling. Proof of the needs of the individual requiring such care shall be required prior to this administrative action, and may be required annually to verify if the need still exists (Section 3.10.3.H.2.c).

9. Allow specialty/craft breweries in the AG and industrial zones, and as a conditional use in the commercial zones. Use standards provide limits on production (6,000 barrels in AG and 15,000 barrels in other zones) and events with restrictions similar to small wineries (Section 3.8.2.E) Clarify that Brew Pubs may brew on-site up to 6,000 barrels as a permitted use.

10. Allow for small animal training by right in AG/IR/UR zones if the animal owners are present during training. (Section 3.7.2.A.1).

11. Allow for the distillation, bottling and sale of brandy in conjunction with a winery, if incidental with wine production/sale, and with a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator (Section 3.4.8 and 3.4.9).

12. Allow various solar and wind turbine energy systems in a variety of zones as conditional uses. Use standards provided for each use (Sections 3.6.6.C and 3.6.6.D).
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13. Allow for a reduction in the 75-foot setback for loading docks from residential zones with a Special Development Permit by the Zoning Administrator (Section 3.9.3.W). Also referenced in the tables for development standards applicable to commercial, industrial and mixed-use zones in Chapter 5.

14. Add findings that the Planning Commission must make in order to approve a Use Permit for congregate care and churches in the AG and AR zones. Findings pertain to compatibility with surrounding uses and changes to the rural character of the community (Sections 3.6.1.A and 3.6.5.C). Also, eliminate seating thresholds for churches, and change hearing authorities.

15. Allow social rehabilitation centers in AG zones, subject to a Use Permit by the Planning Commission and a finding pertaining to compatibility with surrounding uses and changes to the rural character of the community (Section 3.6.5.C).

16. Eliminate the Use Permit requirement for condominiums. This use still needs a map entitlement, and condominium conversions would still require obtaining a Use Permit.

17. Allow trade/vocational schools under the definition of “Private School”, and allow private schools in most zones with a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator. If located in the commercial or MP zones, and less than 500 students, a Minor Use Permit is required.

18. Eliminate the restrictions regarding number of people for winery events in industrial zones, but retain the restrictions on hours.

19. Allow signage for wineries located in industrial zones to be the same as signage permitted for other industrial businesses.

20. Allow for ability with a Minor Use Permit to conduct tasting at small wineries to more than 5 days per week, and at large wineries in industrial zones with more than 15% of floor area devoted to the tasting area.

21. Allow for up to 25% retail sales in conjunction with a permitted wholesale nursery in AG zones, subject to a Minor Use Permit.

22. Include internet cafés as a conditional use in certain zones, a definition for an internet café, and a use standard that prohibits gambling or any other activities that violate federal or state regulations (Section 3.7.4.G).

23. Allow indoor recreation uses in the M-1 and M-2 zones with a Minor Use Permit, a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator in BP and MP zones, or allowed by right if determined by Planning Director to be incidental to the business center and intended primarily to serve its employees.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Allow farm equipment manufacturing in AG zones with a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Allow temporary events in any zone for up to 30 days in a given year with a Temporary Use Permit by Zoning Administrator. This would be an annual permit that must identify all dates for the temporary/special events (Section 3.10.2.L).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Allow for incidental retail uses in the BP/MP zones up to 25% by right, and over that threshold (e.g., a primary retail use) with a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator. Also, business and personal service uses (e.g., spa, tanning, barber shop) have been added to the BP and MP zones as permitted by right if determined by the Planning Director to be incidental to the business center, and intended primarily to serve its employees; otherwise a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator such as in the case of a primary business or personal service use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Allow for farm labor housing in AG zones of up to 36 beds in farm labor group quarters or 12 units in AG zones by right pursuant to state regulations. Additional housing permitted subject to a Minor Use Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Provide setbacks requirements for feed lots (Section 3.4.3.B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Allow for Cottage Food Operations under the home occupations per Use Standard (Section 3.9.3.F.5.r) as well as a definition in Chapter 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Allow for up to 3 home occupations per dwelling, subject to the same standards (Section 3.9.3.F.2.a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Allow electric fencing in zones other than AG and M-1/M-2 with a Minor Use Permit, and provide standards (Section 3.9.3.X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Allow for SF room rental and require a permit if 3 or more roommates, with maximum of 5 roommates (Section 3.5.1.K).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Allow farmers markets as a temporary use (Table 3.3) in certain zones, subject to a Temporary Use Permit. Permitted by right in the certain zones if certified by the Agricultural Commissioner, limited primarily to the sale of fresh fruits and vegetables, operated no more than once per week, and located within ¼ mile of a transit station or truck line bus stop or a “food desert area”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Allow MF in the commercial and mixed-use zones by right up to 30 DU/ac., and up to 40 DU/ac. when adjacent to transit services. Higher densities are possible with a Use Permit by the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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35. Allow any MF projects of 150 DU or less subject to a staff-level Design Review. For MF projects over 150 DU in the RD zones, require Design Review by the Planning Commission. For MF projects over 150 DU in the commercial and mixed-use zones, require a Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

F. Revisions to Combining Zones (Chapter 4)

1. Clarify how the Planning Director determines compliance with the intent of the PC zone, visibility of proposed improvements, and when a Use Permit is required (Section 4.7.4).

G. Revisions to Development Standards (Chapter 5)

1. Provide development standards pertaining to residential land uses as follows:
   - Where MF is adjacent to SF, allow for a minimum of 20 ft. for single-story structures, 40 ft. for two-story, and 60 ft. for three-story or higher. Any further reduction in setback can be accomplished by a Special Development Permit (Table 5-5).
   - Require 2 trees in the front yard for every SF lot and MF project (Section 5.2.4.B.6.d/e).
   - Require a minimum 60% (maximum of 40% hardscape) landscaping in the required front and side-street yards for all SF lots of 10,000 sq. ft. or less. Also, maintenance provisions, ability to use off-setting landscaped areas in case of circular driveway, and ability to provide more hardscape or landscape alternatives through the design review process (Section 5.2.4.B.2).
   - Increase the maximum square footage for accessory structures (e.g., sheds) in AR zones from 50% of the habitable floor area of the primary dwelling to be equal in size to the habitable floor area of the primary dwelling, provided that the lot is at least 1 acre in size. If the lot is at least 2 acres in size, the maximum square footage for accessory structures may be twice the habitable floor area of the primary dwelling. Also, allow for these accessory structures to be the same height as primary dwelling. Allow for exceptions to the maximum area and height with a Minor Use Permit (Section 5.4.5.B, Table 5.8).
   - Allow for larger accessory dwellings by right on a sliding scale based on the size of the residential lot—permitted at a maximum of 400 square feet for all residential lots of 8,500 square feet or less, permitted at a maximum of 500 square feet for all residential lots between 8,501 and 10,000 square feet, and permitted at a maximum of 600 square feet for all residential lots over 10,000 square feet. Larger accessory dwellings up to a max of 1,200 square feet are subject to a Use Permit by the Zoning Administrator (Section 5.4.5.C.5).
• Reduce the minimum lot size for accessory dwellings in RD zones to 5,200 sq. ft. (Section 5.4.5.C.1).

• Increase the minimum lot size requirements for all lots served by well/septic to be consistent with the 2010 liquid waste ordinance changes per EMD—generally, the minimum lot size with well/septic is 2 ac., and the minimum lot size with septic only is 1 ac.

• Provide for reduced setbacks in those cases where accessible accommodations are provided pursuant to federal and state housing regulations (Section 5.2.1.D)

• Provide density bonus regulations for MF for proximity to transit—automatic increase of 10-15% (same as permitted by the HIP program), and ability to request a 25% increase with a Special Development Permit (Section 5.4.3, Table 5.5, and Section 6.4.6.G.2.c).

2. Provide development standards pertaining to fencing as follows:

• In the case of non-conforming fencing for commercial uses, require that all non-conforming fences (e.g., wood fences) be maintained with metal posts, minimal gaps, no broken boards, and no sections that lean. Chain-link fencing should be maintained with slats, and to the same standards as above. In the event that the non-conforming fence does not meet these standards, or needs to be replaced, it shall be replaced according to current standards (Section 5.2.5.A.4.).

• Limit solid fencing within the required front yard of SF zone to a height of 36 inches, unless a Minor Use Permit is granted for a solid fence up to a maximum of 6 feet in height. Also, provide standards for maintenance of existing non-conforming solid fencing (Section 5.2.5.A.2.b).

• Require pools to have perimeter fencing, except for those otherwise restricted from public access (Section 5.2.5.A.3).

• Clarify height measurement when a fence is constructed on a retaining wall (Section 5.2.5.A.6).

• Allow fences up to 7 feet in height along interior property lines since no building permit is required for a fence under 7 feet in height, but retain the 6-foot high “requirement” where noted since the increased height would mean greater costs for property owners, particularly for those owners of commercial properties where adjacent to residential and therefore required to construct a masonry wall along the common boundary (Section 5.2.5.A.6).
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3. Provide development standards pertaining to commercial land uses as follows:
   • Limit hours for truck loading/unloading in commercial, mixed-use, and industrial zones when located within 300 feet of residential uses, otherwise a Minor Use Permit is required (Sections 5.5.2.D.2 and 5.6.2.D.2).
   • Require an Abandoned Cart Protection Plan that would specify measures (e.g., wheel locks) that will be implemented to prevent the removal of shopping carts from the premises (Sections 5.5.2.D.3 and 5.6.2.D.3).

4. Provide mixed-use development standards as follows:
   • Provide development standards for mixed-use development in 3 new zones (Section 5.7)
   • Require a minimum (mandatory) residential component to be provided within mixed-use developments when located adjacent to transit services (Table 5.11). Minimum densities vary, based on proximity to and type of transit services.
   • Require a minimum (mandatory) residential component to be provided as part of all mixed-use developments in the Corridor Mixed-Use (CMZ) zone, regardless of proximity to transit services (Section 5.7.3.A, Table 5.11).
   • Provide a parking reduction matrix for mixed-use projects (Section 5.7.1.B.3.b).
   • Provide a process for the review of phased development in mixed-use entitlement applications, and amendments to an approved mixed-use development plan (Section 5.7.2).

5. Provide development standards pertaining to signs as follows:
   • Provide regulations for Gateway signs along the freeway at key entrances to shopping, office or auto districts, subject to a Use Permit by the Board of Supervisors (Section 5.10.1.Q).
   • Provide standards for digital billboards, including ability for an operating agreement w/County (Section 5.10.1.N.8).
   • Provide more flexibility for relocation of off-site signs with a minimum sign ratio of at least 4:1, and ability to relocate billboards along any Special Sign Corridor or thoroughfare within the unincorporated area, and ability to use an operating agreement (similar to a development agreement) to approve special terms and conditions and vary from development standards (Section 5.10.1.O).
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- Change the hearing authority for community interest group signs from a Use Permit by the Planning Commission to a Minor Use Permit (Section 5.10.1.L).

- Allow for community identification signs, other than those erected by DOT within the right-of-way, subject to a Minor Use Permit (Section 5.10.1.M.6).

- Allow for historic signs that exceed the maximum height, area or placement requirements for the zoning district, provided that they promote the historic character and architecture of the building/district, subject to a Use Permit by the Planning Commission (Section 5.10.1.R).

- Allow for a master sign program for commercial/mixed-use/industrial districts having multiple buildings, and signs exceeding the maximum height, area, setback or placement requirements for the zoning district, subject to a Use Permit and findings related to a uniform design theme (Section 5.10.1.S).

6. Provide development standards pertaining to parking as follows:

- Convert parking requirements to a table format (Tables 5.12 through 5.15).

- Require trash/recyclable containers within parking areas of over 40 parking spaces (Section 5.9.4.I.4).

- Allow parking reductions through the design review process (Section 5.9.5.B)

- Allow automatic parking reductions (by number or percentage of spaces) for shared parking, proximity to transit services, providing transit shelters, tree preservation, providing additional bicycle parking (Section 5.9.5.C).

- Provide a process for evaluation of shared parking and parking reductions through the design review process (Section 5.9.7).

- Allow for the consideration of on-street parking to satisfy parking requirements (Section 5.9.2).

- Provide parking reductions for MF projects when located adjacent to transit services (Table 5.12A)

- Require at least one parking space for any MF project over 30 DU/ac. to be covered and assigned to each unit within the project (Table 5.12)
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- Allow for stormwater quality control features and water conservation landscaping species in general landscape standards (Section 5.2.4)
- Provide regulations for parking lot lighting and light standard locations (Section 5.9.4.1).
- Allow for exceptions through the design review process to shading requirements for parking areas such as needed to provide stormwater quality features, solar panels, green roofs, etc. (Section 5.9.4.E.4.b).
- Allow for alternative energy systems (solar and wind) as permitted accessory structures in parking areas, subject to Design Review (Section 5.9.4.J).
- Limit the parking reduction possible provided either by automatic reductions or those approved through Design Review to 25% of required parking. Greater parking reductions are possible, but must be approved by a Special Development Permit.

7. Revise parking requirements for the following uses

- Church—1/4 seats, or 1/50 sq. ft.
- College—1/3 employees, plus 1/3 students
- Hospital—2/bed, plus 1/3 employees
- Restaurant/bar—1/3 seats, plus 1/100 sq. ft. of outdoor dining area
- Bank/S&L—3/1000 sq. ft.
- Office—3.5/1000 sq. ft.
- Medical/dental—4.5/1000 sq. ft.
- Congregate care—1/3 beds, plus 1/3 employees
- General retail/shopping centers—4.0/1000 sq. ft.

H. Revisions to Administration and the Entitlement Process (Chapter 6)

1. Combine Development Plan Review and Design Review under a new section entitled Site Plan Review (Section 6.3)
2. Allow for a review by PRC for non-discretionary commercial, industrial, and mixed-use projects for those that exceed a certain threshold (Section 6.3.1.C.3)
3. Require Design Review for any subdivision of 20 lots or more (Section 6.3.2.A).
4. Require that any new freestanding or tenant sign be considered a non-discretionary project subject to Design Review. Modifications to existing signs, are permitted without design review, provided that the sign conforms to current standards for the zoning district in which it is located (Section 6.3.2.F).
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5. Provide for a Minor (administrative) Use Permit process (Section 6.4.2)

6. Incorporate elements/findings for Variance, Exception, Lot Reduction Permit, and Special Review of Parking into the section pertaining to Special Development Permits (Section 6.4.6)

7. Provide the ability to cluster residential lots in order to protect open space resources (Section 6.4.6.F)

8. Provide more focus to the density bonus possible for preservation of sensitive environmental features—has to be more than those features that are required to be protected (Section 6.4.6.G.2.a)

9. Provide for density bonuses for affordable housing and child care facilities per state regulations. Note that this section was prepared by County Counsel (Section 6.5.4)

10. Provide for the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) as prepared for the Housing Element (Section 6.5.5).

11. Provide process for Room Rental Permit (Section 6.5.6).

12. Clarify when various land use entitlements are subject to an automatic extension (Section 6.4.1.I).

13. Clarify that the Planning Director must authorize issuance of a valid building permit in order to extend the term of a land use entitlements (i.e., typically valid for 3 years) when a building permit is pending, and standardize these provisions for a Use Permit, Development Plan Review, and Special Development Permit (Sections 6.3.1.E, 6.4.3.F, 6.4.6.K).

14. Revise the section on “Enforcement” to be consistent with current practices of Code Enforcement (Section 6.6).

I. Revisions to Definitions (Chapter 7)

1. Add illustrations to help explain building story, building height, grade, zero lot line, lot width, front/rear lot lines, through lot, and general yard areas.

2. Clarify the definition of congregate care facilities to include assisted living facilities and to indicate when kitchens are permitted.

3. Note under the definition of crops that any use or activity that violates state or federal law is prohibited.

4. Organize all definitions alphabetically.
TABLE 1, Continued

5. Provide definitions for the following:

- Heavy Equipment
- Farm worker housing
- General personal services
- Tattoo shop
- General repair services
- Brew pub
- Campground
- Race Track
- Internet café
- Gateway Sign
- General office use
- General retail use
- Drive-up window
- Pawn shop
- Major auto repair
- Minor auto repair
- Parking lot or garage
- Vehicle auction
- Short-term borrow mining operations Surface mining operations
- Concrete batch plant
- Laboratory
- Mini-storage
- Warehousing
- Bus depot
- Bus shelter
- Truck, freight, or draying terminal
- Incidental keeping of animals
- Incidental retail sales
- Outdoor display and storage
- Garage sale
- Certified farmer’s market
- Promotional sales and display
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

FOR SACRAMENTO COUNTY ZONING CODE UPDATE

CONTROL NUMBER: PLNP 2012-00092

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act.
## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant or No Impact</th>
<th>Analyzed in the Prior EIR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant or No Impact</th>
<th>Analyzed in the Prior EIR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Zoning Code Update (ZCU) would not conflict with land use plans or policies, because it is designed to conform to the adopted 2030 Sacramento County General Plan and to implement the Plan’s land use plans and policies. With the adoption of the 2030 General Plan (modified version of the Mixed Use Alternative) any impacts associated with land use plans or policies were determined to be less than significant (General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (GPFEIR) pp. 2-11 – 2-12; Control No. 02-GPB-0105 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations 11/9/2011, pp. 6, 30-31, GPFEIR pp. 3-83–3-87).

However, the Zoning Code Update changes some land use regulations, particularly development standards, and adds new uses. Refer to the Initial Study.

**b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant or No Impact</th>
<th>Analyzed in the Prior EIR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ZCU would not disrupt or divide established communities, because it would not change existing zoning designations or create physical barriers that would substantially limit movement through the community. The ZCU, by itself, does not propose or authorize any development. As such, impacts resulting from ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.

---

1 Potentially Significant indicates that 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.

4 Analyzed in the Prior EIR means that the project falls within the scope of the prior analysis in the General Plan FEIR and does not result in any additional impacts. For the purposes of this checklist, impacts in this category are those that remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation measures from the GPFEIR are applied, and are encompassed within the Statement of Overriding Considerations that was adopted when the GPFEIR was certified and the General Plan adopted. See Initial Study discussion.
2. **POPULATION/HOUSING** - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ZCU would neither directly nor indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth beyond what was evaluated in the 2030 General Plan FEIR. The 2030 General Plan directs population growth toward areas that are already urbanized or that can support additional urban development. The Code Update would establish a new Mixed-Use zoning designation and set forth standards applicable to new development that would, for example, accommodate higher residential densities in certain areas consistent with Plan designations. However, the ZCU, by itself, does not formally propose or authorize new development. Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.

3. **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ZCU would not change existing agricultural zoning designations, but would add newly-identified uses to agricultural zones, specifically commercial-scale solar and wind energy facilities. Such facilities have been previously allowed in agricultural zones, subject to conditional use permits, under Zoning Code Title 1, §110-30.5 (Use Permits for Uses Not Otherwise Provided For) and Title III, §310-15, Utility and Public Service Uses).

However, proposed new facilities would be subject to CEQA review to assess site-specific impacts in concert with minor or conditional-use permits. Additionally, development standards require that both solar and wind facilities avoid prime farmlands, unless mitigated consistent with County policy (ZCU, §3.6.6(C), (D)). Since the ZCU by itself does not propose or authorize such
The ZCU would not, of itself, affect Williamson Act contracts, because it does not change agricultural zoning or allowed agricultural uses. As noted above, the ZCU would conditionally permit commercial-scale solar and wind energy facilities in agricultural zones. However, development standards prohibit locating both solar and wind facilities on Williamson Act Agricultural Preserves, unless such uses are specifically authorized under the Williamson Act contract. (ZCU, §3.6.6(C), (D)). Since the ZCU by itself does not propose or authorize development of any kind, but only sets forth the zoning designations in which such facilities could be located, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be less than significant.

The County ZCU would not, of itself, introduce incompatible uses near agricultural uses. The ZCU would conditionally permit commercial solar and wind energy facilities in agricultural zones; such industrial facilities could be perceived as incompatible with agricultural operations. However, as noted above, these facilities have been previously allowed in agricultural zones under conditional use permits. CEQA review for site-specific projects would identify whether new facilities would be incompatible where proposed, and would require appropriate mitigation. Since the ZCU by itself does not propose or authorize solar or wind energy facilities, but only sets forth the zoning designations in which they could be located, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be less than significant.

The ZCU would not, by itself, substantially alter viewsheds or vistas, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development projects. Proposals under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts to viewsheds. New uses, such as the solar and wind energy facilities discussed above, are directed to avoid locations in scenic highway viewsheds or where a project would impact views from historic places (ZCU §§ 3.6.6(C)(3)(c)(iii), 3.6.6(D)(3)(c)(iii)). Accordingly, impacts associated with the ZCU enactment are

| b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract? | X | The ZCU would not, of itself, affect Williamson Act contracts, because it does not change agricultural zoning or allowed agricultural uses. As noted above, the ZCU would conditionally permit commercial-scale solar and wind energy facilities in agricultural zones. However, development standards prohibit locating both solar and wind facilities on Williamson Act Agricultural Preserves, unless such uses are specifically authorized under the Williamson Act contract. (ZCU, §3.6.6(C), (D)). Since the ZCU by itself does not propose or authorize development of any kind, but only sets forth the zoning designations in which such facilities could be located, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be less than significant. |
| c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses? | X | The County ZCU would not, of itself, introduce incompatible uses near agricultural uses. The ZCU would conditionally permit commercial solar and wind energy facilities in agricultural zones; such industrial facilities could be perceived as incompatible with agricultural operations. However, as noted above, these facilities have been previously allowed in agricultural zones under conditional use permits. CEQA review for site-specific projects would identify whether new facilities would be incompatible where proposed, and would require appropriate mitigation. Since the ZCU by itself does not propose or authorize solar or wind energy facilities, but only sets forth the zoning designations in which they could be located, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be less than significant. |
| a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas? | X | The ZCU would not, by itself, substantially alter viewsheds or vistas, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development projects. Proposals under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts to viewsheds. New uses, such as the solar and wind energy facilities discussed above, are directed to avoid locations in scenic highway viewsheds or where a project would impact views from historic places (ZCU §§ 3.6.6(C)(3)(c)(iii), 3.6.6(D)(3)(c)(iii)). Accordingly, impacts associated with the ZCU enactment are |
### b. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The ZCU, would not, by itself, substantially degrade the County’s existing visual character, since it does not formally propose or authorize any specific development project. However, new energy facility uses as described above, as well as project proposals under the new Mixed-Use zone, might be perceived to degrade a particular site’s visual character. Still, such uses would be subject to project- and site-specific CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, in addition to use-specific design requirements in the ZCU, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts to visual character. Consequently, impacts associated with ZCU enactment are anticipated to be less than significant.

### 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?

The ZCU would not of itself create new sources of light or glare that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect views, because it does not formally propose or authorize any specific development project. However, new energy facility uses as described above, as well as project proposals under the new Mixed-Use zone, might generate new light, glare or shadow. Such uses would be subject to project- and site-specific CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, in addition to use-specific design requirements in the ZCU, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts. Additionally, new ZCU parking lot lighting design standards require full cut-off fixtures, which would reduce glare from new light sources. Moreover, uses requiring site and street lighting are still required to comply with the existing Sacramento County Improvement Standards, Section 5, *Street Light Design*, which balance needs for safety with avoiding adverse effects from new light sources. Consequently, impacts associated with ZCU enactment are anticipated to be less than significant.

### 5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ZCU would not result in safety hazards for people living or working near airports because it would not change mapped airport safety zones and safety requirements accompanying such zones. Impacts associated with ZCU enactment are anticipated to be less than significant.
| b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards? | X | The ZCU would not result in excess human exposure to airport noise, because the ZCU does not propose or authorize any specific development project in the vicinity of any airport. Moreover, the ZCU would not change local airport noise-abatement programs or Sacramento County noise-attenuation requirements for new construction in the vicinity of airports or under flight paths (2030 General Plan, Noise Element, Policies NO-2 – NO-4). As such, impacts associated with ZCU adoption would be anticipated to be less than significant. |
| c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft? | X | The ZCU would not adversely affect navigable airspace because it does not formally propose or authorize any specific development project. New wind energy facility uses conditionally permitted by the ZCU could potentially have such an adverse effect, except that the ZCU expressly prohibits their installation where such a facility would adversely impact airport flight operations. Additionally, such uses would be subject to project-and site-specific CEQA, Development Plan and Design Review, in addition to use-specific design requirements in the ZCU, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts. Accordingly, impacts to navigable airspace from ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant. |
| 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 ZCU would not result in changes to air traffic patterns because it does not formally propose or authorize any specific development project that would cause such changes. Accordingly, impacts to air traffic patterns from ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant. |

6. **PUBLIC SERVICES** - Would the project:
   i. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project? | X | The County Zoning Code Update would not result in impacts to water supplies beyond those evaluated in the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR. Refer to the Initial Study. |
   i. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project? | X | The County Zoning Code Update would not result in impacts to wastewater treatment facilities or sewer services beyond those evaluated in the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR (GPFEIR p. 5-21). Refer to the Initial Study. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</th>
<th></th>
<th>The ZCU by itself would not directly require landfill capacity, since it does not propose or authorize any development. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR evaluated future solid waste disposal demand and determined that the Kiefer Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate General Plan demand through 2035 or later (GPFEIR p. 4-38). Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU by itself would not result in impacts associated with wastewater treatment or sewage transport system construction beyond those evaluated in the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR. Refer to the Initial Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU by itself would not result in substantial impacts associated with providing storm water drainage facilities, since it does not propose or authorize development. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan Update FEIR evaluated existing and planned storm water system capacity and determined that it would accommodate General Plan demand (GPFEIR pp. 7-24 – 7-25, 7-61 – 7-62), presuming that new development complies with the County Improvement Standards and Floodplain Management Ordinance to minimize surface runoff. Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU by itself would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with providing electrical or natural gas service, since it does not propose or authorize development, and the 2030 General Plan incorporates policies related to siting energy production and distribution facilities that would ensure impacts are minimized and/or mitigated. (GPFEIR pp. 4-18, 4-20, 4-28 - 4-29). Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU by itself would not directly require new emergency services, since it does not propose or authorize development. The 2030 General Plan incorporates policies related to providing emergency services that would ensure impacts are minimized and/or mitigated. (GPFEIR pp. 4-27-28, 4-40). Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|   | Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services? |   | X | The ZCU by itself would not directly require new park and recreation services or facilities, since it does not propose or authorize development. Additionally, the 2030 General Plan incorporates policies associated with planning for and providing park and recreation services that would ensure impacts are minimized and/or mitigated (2030 General Plan policies PF 120 – PF 125, pp. 61-62). Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The County ZCU, by itself, would not result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips, since it does not propose or authorize any new development. Future large development projects under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, and/or Development Plan Review, and would be required to evaluate, avoid and minimize level-of-service impacts as necessary. However, the 2030 General Plan identifies several areas in the County where growth will occur, potentially changing vehicle trips and levels of service in and around those areas. Refer to the Initial Study for expanded discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The County ZCU, by itself, would not result in impacts to access or circulation since it does not propose or authorize any new development. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts associated with access and/or circulation. However, as noted above, the 2030 General Plan identifies several new growth areas in the County, potentially changing access and/or circulation in and around those areas. Refer to the Initial Study for expanded discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The County ZCU, by itself, would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with roadway safety, since it does not propose or authorize any new development. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to avoid or minimize roadway safety impacts. Additionally, the 2030 General Plan incorporates policies related to transportation facility planning, design and implementation that would work to minimize and/or mitigate safety impacts (2030 General Plan Circulation Element, Policies CI-1, 7, 8, 12, 32, 34 and 38). Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>AIR QUALITY</strong> - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

|   |   | The ZCU, by itself, would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with odors, because it does not propose or authorize development that would cause odors. Generally, land uses are organized in the Zoning Code and County Zoning Map to separate odor-generating uses from sensitive receptors and excessive odor is considered a code violation (ZCU §§ 2.5.1 (Agricultural-Residential Zoning Districts), 2.6.1 (Residential Zoning Districts), 2.9.1 (Commercial Zoning Districts), 2.10.1 (Industrial Zoning Districts), 3.4.6(C) (Riding Stables), 3.7.8(B) (Medical, Dental or Optical Laboratories), 3.8.5(D)(2) (Recycling and Greenwaste Facilities), 3.9.3(F) (Home Occupations), 3.9.3(H) (Animal Keeping), 4.3.4(A)(6) Food Processing Combining Zone, 4.7.4(E)(2) (Parkway Corridor Combining Zone), and 6.4.3(E)(1)(d) (Approval Criteria for Conditional Use Permits).
|   |   | Additionally, odor-generating uses, except for agricultural operations, are subject to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Rule 402, which prohibits any emissions constituting a nuisance to the general public. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant. |

### 9. NOISE - Would the project:

|   |   | The ZCU would not, by itself, result in adverse physical impacts associated with excessive noise, because it does not propose or authorize any new development. However, the introduction of new allowed uses, notably wind-energy facilities and mixed-use development with reduced front-yard setbacks, could result in noise exposure that exceeds applicable standards. While wind-energy facilities would be subject to use permits and required CEQA review, impacts associated with setbacks could arise in development permitted by right. Refer to the Initial Study, Land Use discussion. |

- **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**
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, result in substantial temporary ambient noise levels because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to the County Noise Ordinance (County Code, Chapter 6.68), which places limits on noise duration and restrictions on evening and nighttime noise. Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, affect groundwater supplies because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. However, development under the ZCU, as anticipated by the 2030 General Plan, could affect groundwater supply. Refer to the Initial Study (Public Services – Water Supply) for expanded discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, alter drainage patterns because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, as well as the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards and Design Guidelines. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, introduce development into any 100-year floodplain because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, ZCU Section 4.24, Flood Combining Zoning District Standards, as well as the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards and Design Guidelines. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, affect flood flows within any 100-year floodplain because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to numerous ZCU provisions that govern placement of structures in 100-year floodplains (e.g. Chapters 2, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, expose people or structures to flood losses because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to numerous ZCU provisions that would reduce such impacts (e.g. Chapters 2, 3, 4.2, 4.5, 4.9), ZCU Section 4.24, Flood Combining Zoning District Standards, local Drainage Master Plans, CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, as well as the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards and Design Guidelines. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, exceed storm water drainage capacity because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to numerous ZCU provisions that would reduce such impacts, particularly those from parking lots (§5.9.4(A), (B), facilitating use of storm water quality source control and treatment facilities and pervious paving materials), as well as local Drainage Master Plans, CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, as well as the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards and Design Guidelines. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, create polluted runoff or degrade ground or surface water quality, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, as well as numerous ZCU provisions that would reduce such impacts, particularly those from parking lots as described above, and local Drainage Master Plans, the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively), applicable water-quality requirements of the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards and Design Guidelines. Additionally, the ZCU would not change existing County regulations governing water wells and septic tanks that are designed to protect water quality. Furthermore, the ZCU would not change existing regulations governing underground storage tanks, which are subject to federal and State regulations for operating standards, leak reporting requirements, and corrective action requirements. Future development under the ZCU would be required to comply with these regulations. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.

### 11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>The ZCU, would not, by itself, expose people or structures to earthquake losses, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project, nor are there Alquist-Priolo fault zones in the County. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, the Uniform Building Code and applicable construction standards for earthquake safety. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, result in erosion, siltation or topsoil losses, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, the County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, and applicable regulations for minimizing erosion and sedimentation. Moreover, development in new erosion zones within the Parkway Corridor (PC) Combining Zone District would be subject to specific setback requirements and design review to minimize erosion effects. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU, would not, by itself, subject people or structures to unstable soils or geological formations, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, the County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, and applicable regulations for minimizing erosion and sedimentation. Moreover, development in new erosion zones within the Parkway Corridor (PC) Combining Zone District would be subject to specific setback requirements and design review to minimize erosion effects. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong>&lt;br&gt;The ZCU, would not, by itself, place development on soils incapable of supporting septic or other alternative wastewater systems, because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA and/or Development Plan Review, Title 16 of the Sacramento County Code and the Uniform Building Code, and applicable requirements for wastewater system design administered by the Environmental Management Department. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong>&lt;br&gt;The ZCU, would not, by itself, result in a substantial loss of important mineral resources because it would not change existing zoning designations, nor does it propose or authorize any specific development project. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan avoids designating important mineral resource areas for uses that would interfere with mineral recovery (GPFEIR p. 13-35). Additionally, large discretionary projects would be subject to further CEQA review, where impacts to mineral resource availability would be assessed, avoided and/or minimized. Impacts associated with ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong>&lt;br&gt;The ZCU, would not, by itself, result in a substantial loss of important paleontological resources because it does not propose or authorize any specific development project. However, development under the ZCU, as anticipated by the 2030 General Plan, could affect paleontological resources. Refer to the Initial Study for expanded discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>The ZCU would not, by itself, affect species or plant or animal communities, because it would not change existing zoning designations, nor does it propose or authorize any specific development projects. Proposals requiring subdivision of property or other discretionary action under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, habitat conservation programs, and the Swainson’s Hawk Ordinance, which would work to avoid or minimize impacts to biological resources. Uses permitted by right under the ZCU would still be subject to state and federal regulation for species protection. New uses, such as the solar and wind energy facilities discussed above, are directed to avoid sensitive habitats unless mitigated satisfactorily (ZCU §§ 3.6.6(C)(3)(c)(ii), 3.6.6(D)(3)(c)(ii). New mixed-uses would be primarily located along already-developed transportation corridors (2030 General Plan Land Use Diagram, November 2011). Accordingly, impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, because it would not change existing zoning designations, nor does it propose or authorize any specific development projects. Proposals requiring subdivision of property or other discretionary action under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to avoid or minimize natural habitat impacts. Uses permitted by right under the ZCU would still be subject to state and federal regulation for species protection, as well as 2030 General Plan Conservation Element Policies CO-70 and CO-71 for habitat protection. New uses, such as the solar and wind energy facilities discussed above, are directed to avoid sensitive habitats unless mitigated satisfactorily (ZCU §§ 3.6.6(C)(3)(c)(ii), 3.6.6(D)(3)(c)(ii). New mixed-uses would be primarily along already-developed transportation corridors (General Plan Land Use Diagram, November 2011). Accordingly, impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>The ZCU would not, by itself, cause substantial changes to historic resources, because it does not propose or authorize any particular development. Nothing in the ZCU language changes how historical resources are addressed. Moreover, future proposals requiring subdivision of property or other discretionary action under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA review, which would work to avoid or mitigate minimize impacts. Impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, create substantial hazards associated with hazardous material transport or use, because it does not propose or authorize any development project which would involve such transport. Future proposals involving such materials would be required to comply with existing federal and state regulations. Additionally, fifteen policies and numerous implementation measures address hazardous materials in the 2030 General Plan Hazardous Materials Element. Impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, expose the public or the environment to risks associated with hazardous material storage or release (spills) because it does not propose or authorize any development project which would involve such materials. Future proposals would be required to comply with existing federal and state regulations. As noted above, fifteen 2030 General Plan policies and implementation measures address hazardous materials. Impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ZCU would not, by itself, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous substances near schools, because it does not propose or authorize any development project. Future proposals would be required to comply with existing federal and state regulations. Additionally, public school districts are subject to the California Education Code §§17213(b) and the Department of Education’s School Site Guidelines, which require review and mitigation for hazardous material presence on or within ¼ mile of a proposed school site. Private schools are subject to discretionary review, where CEQA compliance would require avoidance and/or mitigation of hazardous material presence. As noted above, fifteen 2030 General Plan policies address hazardous materials. Impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ZCU would regulate land use in the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County where there are known hazardous material sites. Existing regulations preclude development of any known cleanup site, zoning notwithstanding, until the hazardous condition has been abated to the point that the proposed use will neither aggravate the hazard condition nor be adversely affected by the hazardous condition. Impacts associated with the ZCU adoption are thus anticipated to be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?** | X |
|   | The ZCU would not, by itself, impair implementation or interfere with emergency response plans since it does not propose or authorize any development, and nothing in the ZCU language precludes such plans. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan Safety Element sets forth policies that apply to emergency services and evacuation planning; the ZCU does not change those policies. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant. |

**15. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS/CLIMATE CHANGE – Would the project:**

| **a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment?** | X |
|   | The ZCU would not, by itself, result in greenhouse gas emissions generation since it does not propose or authorize any development. Future development under the ZCU would be subject to CEQA, Development Plan and/or Design Review, which would work to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan Air Quality, Conservation, Housing and Land Use Elements as well as the Sacramento County Climate Action Plan, set forth policies and implementation measures that apply to greenhouse gas generation and climate change that would apply to proposed projects. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant. |
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The ZCU would not, by itself, conflict with greenhouse-gas emission reduction plans, policies or regulations since it does not propose or authorize any development, and nothing in the ZCU language precludes such plans. Moreover, the 2030 General Plan Air Quality, Conservation, Housing and Land Use Elements, as well as the Sacramento County Climate Action Plan, set forth policies and implementation measures that apply to greenhouse gas generation and climate change; the ZCU does not change those policies. Accordingly, impacts associated with ZCU adoption are anticipated to be less than significant.
### SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CONSISTENCY</th>
<th>Current Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Not Consistent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project would not change Plan designations or policy. The proposed ZCU implements 2030 General Plan policies for mixed-use development and increased land-use intensity in identified areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project would not change community plans or policies. The proposed ZCU does not override community plan designations or policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Zone</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of ZCU would not change current zoning. Proponents of changing existing zoning designations must comply with County administrative and legislative processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>