

## CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project Title:** 13<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Stations Renovation
2. **Lead Agency:**  
Sacramento Regional Transit District  
1400 29<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento CA 95816
3. **Contact Person:** David Solomon (916) 557-4682
4. **Project Location:** 13<sup>th</sup> Street and 16<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Stations
5. **Project Sponsor:**  
Sacramento Regional Transit District  
1400 29<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento CA 95816
6. **General Plan Designation:** Urban, mixed-use (Transportation Utilities, Residential, Commercial, Office)
7. **Zoning:** General Commercial – Special Planning District; Residential Mixed Use – Special Planning District; Office Building – Special Planning District
8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed project is to construct various station improvements at the 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Street light rail stations, which are located along Whitney Street (the alley between Q Street and R Street) and within the R Street Corridor redevelopment area (Figure 1). Station improvements proposed by the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) include project elements to enhance aesthetics and public safety, including: (1) the addition of new bus and light rail shelters, access ramps, passenger information signage and public address systems, and artwork; (2) updating existing features such as access ramps and landscaping; (3) replacing and upgrading lighting systems, shelters, and site furniture; and (4) retrofitting electrical systems. Improvements at the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Station would require the acquisition of property for an access easement. The affected property is at the northeast corner of 15<sup>th</sup> Street and the Whitney Street alley. The property acquisition would not affect any buildings or structures.

Specific project activities are dependant on availability of funds. Construction is expected to begin spring of 2007 and be completed within eight to twelve months.

Related activities by the City of Sacramento under the same grant proposal received a Categorical Exemption and are not part of this Initial Study.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**  
Land uses in the project area are various and include residential, commercial, industrial, public, and other land uses. The project area is bounded by the downtown Capitol Area on the north, the residential Southside Neighborhood to the south and the R Street Corridor to the east and west (MIG, 2004).



**10. Other agencies whose approval is required:**

RT, in partnership with Capitol Area Development Authority (CADA) and the City of Sacramento (City), received a grant from the SACOG Community Development Grants program. The grant is administered by the California Transportation Commission and the California Department of Transportation. All environmental documentation will be submitted to the State Clearinghouse.

The proposed project is a transportation-related project listed by SACOG as requiring partial federal funding and is subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review. A Preliminary Environmental Study and Programmatic Categorical Exclusion will be prepared and submitted to Caltrans, District 3 to satisfy Federal Highway Administration and NEPA processes.

Some of the proposed work near the 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Street Stations may extend onto City properties. RT's Operations and Maintenance Agreement with the City provides for RT to work within a City Right-of-Way with only City approval of plans; no separate permit is required.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

John Segerdell

Assistant General Manager of Engineering & Construction

Date

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project – specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, and EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impact Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures when were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, is used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**ISSUES:**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**I. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** The project is located in an urban setting, not near trees or rock outcroppings and not within a state scenic highway (Caltrans, 2003). In addition, it does not provide a unique scenic vista. Therefore, project activities would not affect a scenic vista or scenic resources.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Comment:** The project is located within the R Street Corridor, which has been identified by the City as a Key Development Site to redevelop Downtown (EPS, 2005). The *R Street Corridor Plan* and the *R Street Corridor Redevelopment Project* rely on promoting mixed use and transit-connected development linked to the key R Street Light Rail Stations at 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Streets. The stated vision and purpose of the *R Street Corridor Plan* is to transform the R Street Corridor from a warehouse district into a new transit oriented mixed use neighborhood. The project would support the *R Street Corridor Plan* by providing enhanced pedestrian connections to light rail for

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
several planned and existing mixed use projects. The project includes several improvements that support community design objectives, is sensitive to the visual character of the area, and has been reviewed and approved by the City. Project activities would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.				

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

<b>Comment:</b> The project is located in a downtown lighted urban setting with no day or nighttime views. Effects of any upgrades or additions of lighting at the site are expected to be less than significant.
---

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

<b>Comment:</b> The project site is located in an urbanized area and zoned as General Commercial - Special Planning District, Residential Mixed Use - Special Planning District, and Office Building - Special Planning District. Project activities would not affect farmlands.
--

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

<b>Comment:</b> The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, there would be no impact.
--

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**Comment:** The project site and surrounding areas are considered urban in nature. Project activities would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- (a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Comment:** The project site lies within the boundaries of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). Project activities to improve the 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Street stations directly support pedestrian and transit access for several planned residential mixed use projects along the R Street Light Rail Corridor and several planned retail projects. This supports the Transportation Control Measures and Land Use Measures adopted by the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (SMAQMD, 1994). Accordingly, the project is consistent with the applicable air quality plan.

- (b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Comment:** The project is located within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Nonattainment Area and in an area considered to be nonattainment for the state's PM<sub>10</sub> ambient air quality standard (SMAQMD, 2004). The project supports the vision of the R Street Corridor to create a walkable, transit-oriented community centered around light rail, a pollution free transportation system. The project would encourage the use of mass transit and support the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan.

Vehicle emissions associated with construction activities were estimated using the URBEMIS 2002 computer program (ARB, 2002). The calculation based on a projected "worst-case-scenario" for total equipment use, yielded a release of 60 to 80 lbs of NO<sub>x</sub> per day, which is considered a less than significant level (SMAQMD, 2004).

SMAQMD has developed Rules and Regulations to minimize impacts to air quality. At a minimum, the following rules will be implemented:

Rule 401: Ringelmann Chart

- Will not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any one hour in which it is: 1) as dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, or 2) of such opacity as to obscure a human observer's view.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

<p><u>Rule 403: Fugitive Dust</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of water or chemicals for control of dust during construction activities.</li> <li>- Sediment controls will be applied to stockpiles and other surfaces which can give rise to airborne dusts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rule 405: Dust and Condensed Fumes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of Table for Process Weight and Allowable Discharge to calculate allowable discharge of dust into the atmosphere in any one hour.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rule 442: Architectural Coatings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of Table of VOC Content Limits, except as provided in Sections 302, 303, 305, 307, 308, and 309 in Rule 422, to determine appropriate architectural coating.</li> <li>- All architectural coating containers and VOC-material containers will be closed when not in use.</li> <li>- No rust preventative coating for industrial use shall be applied.</li> </ul> <p>By following the Rules and Regulations adopted by the SMAQMD, the project would not significantly contribute to ozone and particulate matter violations.</p>
--

(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Comment:</b> See responses to (a) and (b) above.
---

(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

<b>Comment:</b> Light rail is considered a pollution free transportation system. The project supports increased use of mass transit, benefiting air quality by reducing traffic congestion. Project activities are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. See response to (b) above for construction activities.
---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Comment:** The project site is developed and located in an urban setting. The California Department of Fish & Game’s California Natural Diversity Database lists State and Federal special-status (endangered, threatened, special concern, rare) species known to occur in the Sacramento East 7.5’ Quad. The listed species identified as potentially occurring in the project area are burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Cooper’s hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), purple martin (*Progne subis*), bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*), valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), and giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*). Considering the developed and urban nature of the project site and habitat needs of the listed species, project activities are not expected to affect special-status species.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project area is fully developed and in an urban setting. No riparian habitat, sensitive communities, or federally protected wetlands are located within the project area. Accordingly, no impacts would occur.

(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Comment:** The project area is fully developed and in an urban setting. Project activities would not interfere with the movement of wildlife species or migratory corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.

(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Comment:** All project activities will comply with the City of Sacramento's Tree Ordinance (Title 45 of the Sacramento City Code). Accordingly, the project is consistent with local policies to protect biological resources.

(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**Comment:** The project area does not lie within the boundaries of an approved Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other conservation plan. Accordingly, no impacts would occur.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** Archeological and historic resources are known in the project area, and it is likely that unknown (buried) resources are also located in the project area. Known historic resources include the following (NCIC, 2005):

- City of Sacramento Historic District 1 (1200-1300 Q Street Historic District) is adjacent to the 13<sup>th</sup> Street Station. The district contains a cohesive row of residences dating from 1885-1895, mostly fronting onto Q Street. The cottage located behind 1322 Q Street (facing the 13<sup>th</sup> Street Station), however, is a late nineteenth century Delta type cottage. Many Sacramento alleys once served as auxiliary residential streets lined with very simple cottages. Now, only this one remains of that formerly common street pattern.
- City of Sacramento Historic District 19 (Fremont Park Historic District) is adjacent to the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Station. The district is characterized by the row of high basement Queen Anne houses, mostly constructed in the 1890s, facing Fremont Park.
- The Mary Haley Galarneau House is located at 10<sup>th</sup> and T Streets, approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the 13<sup>th</sup> Street Station. The Galarneau house is considered an excellent example of the Italianate-Eastlake Victorians built at the turn of the century in the Sacramento Bay/Delta region, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- St. Elizabeth's Portuguese National Church is located at 12<sup>th</sup> and S Streets, approximately 500 feet southwest of the 13<sup>th</sup> Street Station. It was the first dedicated Portuguese church in the United States west of New England.
- Remnant tracks of the Sacramento Valley Railroad are found half a block away on R Street. The Sacramento Valley Railroad, completed in 1856, was the first commercial railroad west of the Mississippi and carried the Pony Express mail between Sacramento

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

and Folsom.

- The nearby Union Pacific Railroad tracks, located approximately 1,500 feet east of the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Station, are on the alignment of the historic Western Pacific Railroad. The Western Pacific Railroad was constructed between 1907 and 1909, connecting Oakland (via Sacramento) to points east through the Feather River canyon.

The project would result in changes to the local setting. Because of their small scale, these localized changes would not affect the settings of non-adjacent historical buildings but would affect the adjacent City of Sacramento Historic Districts (Historic District 1 and Historic District 19). The construction of the existing light rail infrastructure (track work, catenary, station features, etc.) in the late 1980s altered the setting along the rear of these two historic districts. The proposed project elements for both the 13<sup>th</sup> Street and 16<sup>th</sup> Street stations would alter these recent light rail features, but would not result in a substantial new change to the existing setting. Accordingly, this is a less-than-significant impact.

Although no impacts to known historical resources would occur, it is possible that subsurface construction work would affect unknown (buried) resources (prehistoric and/or historic). The probability is low, however, because subsurface work would be limited to minor trenching (e.g., for electrical conduit) and other low-impact disturbance. If any historical or unique archeological resources are accidentally uncovered during construction, the contractor is required to follow the procedures outlined in Section 15064.5(f) of the CEQA Guidelines. These procedures include the immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archeologist and implementation of recommended avoidance and minimization measures. This will ensure that any potential impacts are mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                                                                       

**Comment:** Human remains are not known to occur at the project site, but prehistoric and historic archeological resources are often discovered during subsurface excavations in the Downtown Sacramento area. For this project, the likelihood of uncovering human remains is low because the project involves limited subsurface disturbance (mostly minor trenching to install utilities). If any human remains are accidentally discovered during subsurface work, the contractor is required to follow the procedures outlined in Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines. These procedures include stopping work, notifying the Sacramento County Coroner, notifying the California Native American Heritage Commission (if appropriate), and implementing appropriate measures. This will ensure that any potential impacts are mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Comment:** No portion of Sacramento County is affected by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (DOC, 1999). Accordingly, no impact would occur.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** No known active faults traverse the site. The project area is not located in an area mapped pursuant to the California Geological Survey's or California Fault Parameters (2002) and mapped as 10% - 20% probability of exceedance in the next 50 years in its Seismic Hazard Mapping Program (2003). The likelihood of surface rupture or liquefaction is low and impact is considered less than significant. The topography is relatively flat and landslide impacts are not anticipated.

Project activities generally involve cosmetic changes only to existing facilities and do not require geotechnical studies for their design. Bus and light rail shelters will be constructed to California Building Code standards and are not intended for habitation. Therefore, project activities are not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure or landslides.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**Comment:** The project site is fully developed and its ground surface covered with hardscape, asphalt, concrete, gravel, and a minor amount of landscaped surfaces. Soil erosion or loss of topsoil during construction activities would be minimized through adherence to the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) and preventative measures as outlined in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared by the contractor. RT would file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board in accordance with the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. RT would assure that the SWPPP is maintained on the project site and that all water quality standards are maintained. The SWPPP would incorporate sediment and erosion controls such as silt fences and erosion control blankets. Following the completion of construction activities, disturbed areas would either be repaved or landscaped. With the implementation of these standard measures for erosion control, the impact would be less than significant.

(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

**Comment:** The Web Soil Survey classifies the soil at the project site as Urban (NRCS, 2005). This soil type is not considered an expansive soil. Therefore, there would be no impact.

(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

**Comment:** There is no wastewater currently generated from the project site, and that would remain the same after project development. No wastewater impacts would occur.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** The nearest school to the project site is William Land Elementary School, which is located more than one-quarter mile from the project site. Accordingly, there would be no impacts to schools.

The SWPPP developed by the contractor prior to start of construction activities will incorporate BMPs for the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials to prevent the release of hazardous materials into the environment. With implementation of these standard requirements, hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Comment:** The project site is not located on the Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (2005).

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

The site identified as Orchard Supply Company is listed on the Cortese List and is located at 1731 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Sacramento, CA, within 1/8 mile from the project site. Past operations resulted in contamination of soil and groundwater with metals (arsenic and lead), pesticides (chlordane, dieldrin and DDT), and petroleum hydrocarbons. Per Mr. Thomas Tse of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, remediation efforts at the site reduced contaminant concentrations to industrial levels. Four additional sites located within 1/8 mile of the project site are monitored and regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for contamination of groundwater with petroleum hydrocarbons. Groundwater in the area is encountered at 13 to 15 feet below ground surface. Project activities will not impact these sites; however, it is recommended that RT takes the necessary precautions to protect its workers from possible exposure to contaminants in soil and groundwater. Implementation of these standard requirements would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Comment:** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. There is no private airstrip in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Comment:** Project activities do not involve changes in roadway configurations. Emergency personnel would be notified of any complete or partial roadway blockages during construction activities as a standard procedure. Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts to emergency responses to a less than significant level.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project site is located in a developed, urban setting with very minimal risk of wildland fires. Project features would be designed to comply with the City Building and Fire Codes. No increased fire risks would occur due to project activities.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Comment:** No changes in waste discharge requirements are expected at completion of project activities. During construction, the contractor would adhere to the City's Grading and Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and to the BMPs and preventative measures as outlined in the SWPPP prepared by the contractor. BMPs would address erosion and sediment control, wind erosion control, source controls, and waste management. RT would file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board in accordance with the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. RT would assure that the SWPPP is maintained on the project site and that all water quality standards are maintained. Implementation of these standard requirements would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or 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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>Comment:</b> The City of Sacramento supplies water to the project site. Project activities would result in a minor increase in impervious area. Due to the limited use of groundwater in the area, the small increase of impervious surface is considered to have a negligible effect on groundwater recharge.</p>				
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Comment:</b> Project activities will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or alter the course of a stream or river. Measures to prevent flooding on- or off-site or flooding of the stormwater drainage systems would be addressed by the City during the design review stage to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.</p>				
(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Comment:</b> Project activities would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</p>				

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project site is located within a Special Flood Hazard Area, Zone AR, which is defined as an area of special flood hazard which results from the decertification of a previously accredited flood protection system, which is determined to be in the process of being restored to provide a 100-year or greater level of flood protection (FEMA, 1998). Project activities generally involve cosmetic changes to existing facilities and the addition of bus shelters not intended for human habitation. The bus shelters and other aesthetic improvements would not significantly impede or redirect flood flows.

(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project site is not located adjacent to a levee or dam. Project activities generally involve cosmetic changes (i.e., repair of sidewalks, addition of artwork) and the construction or upgrade of bus shelters. These activities would not expose people or structures to flooding, a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				

**Comment:** The project is a collaborative effort of CADA, RT, and the City and located within the R Street Corridor. The *R Street Corridor Plan* and the *R Street Corridor Redevelopment Project* rely on promoting mixed use, transit-connected development linked to the key R Street Light Rail stations at 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Streets. Adopted by the City Council in 1986, the stated vision and purpose of the *R Street Corridor Plan* is to transform the R Street Corridor from a warehouse district into a new transit-oriented mixed use neighborhood. The project would support the *R Street Corridor Plan* by providing enhanced pedestrian improvements and connections to light rail for several planned and existing mixed use projects (CADA Lofts, Fremont Mews, East End Infill Housing Project). The project supports the City’s Community Design Program, which is to (1) improve walkability and transit use and reduce vehicle trips in existing communities where there is the potential for infill and redevelopment; (2) improve quality of life through integrated transportation and land use development or redevelopment projects; and (3) provide transportation infrastructure for developed areas where the built environment already conforms to the principles, but where key features such as sidewalks are missing. The proposed transportation improvements support the CADA and city view for the conversion of older under-utilized land and buildings to vibrant, new, urban mixed uses.

(c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Comment:** The project site does not lie within the boundaries of an approved Habitat Conservation Plan or a Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project site has not been designated by the City's Zoning Map as being located in a Mineral Reserve district. Project activities are generally aesthetic in nature and the construction or upgrade of bus shelters. These activities would not alter access to any potential mineral resources in the area.

**XI. NOISE:** Would the project result in:

(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** The project site is located in an urban setting and bounded by the downtown Capitol Area on the north, the residential Southside Neighborhood to the south, and the R Street Corridor to the east and west. The urban setting of the project site includes numerous potential noise sources. Project activities are expected to increase transit use and support mixed use development within the area. Increased transit use may cause a very minimal periodic increase in ambient noise levels if trains are scheduled to pass through the area more frequently to

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

accommodate ridership. Public address systems, if installed, would increase noise including from announcements made when trains are not in or immediately approaching the stations; however, RT will adjust the volume of the PA systems to minimize impacts on adjacent residences. Any increase in noise would be intermittent, on already established travel routes, and considered to be less than significant. Increased use of mass transit will also reduce vehicle traffic congestion and its associated noise disturbances.

Project activities will support the development of several planned and existing mixed use projects in the area that depend on connects to light rail. The City’s design review process of proposed developments includes adherence to its Noise Ordinance.

Construction activities would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project area. The City Noise Ordinance exempts construction noise levels from limits if construction activity is limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 pm Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Construction equipment’s internal combustion engines need to be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers to be included in the exemption. In addition to limiting hours of construction operation, other noise-reducing measures may include temporary noise barriers for construction equipment and appropriate construction signage. Adherence to the City’s Noise Ordinance would reduce construction activity impacts to less than significant levels.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. There is no private airstrip in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Comment:** The project would support the City's *R Street Corridor Plan* by providing pedestrian accessibility improvements and connects to light rail for several planned and existing mixed use projects (CADA Lofts, Fremont Mews, East End Infill Housing Project). The proposed transportation improvements support CADA and City efforts to convert older under-utilized land and buildings to vibrant, new, urban mixed uses. All future development will need to comply with the City's building/planning codes, which govern permitted uses, densities, and the configuration of buildings. Adherence to these standards would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Since project activities are expected to draw most of its construction workforce from the area, and the period is less than a year, it is expected that workers will remain at their current residences, rather than relocate to and impact the project area.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** No residential units exist on the project site. Project activities would not displace existing housing or people.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:** Would the project:

- |   |
|---|
| (a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically |
|---|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				

- |                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (i) Fire protection?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (ii) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

<b>Comment:</b> Project activities would not affect existing government facilities nor cause the need for additional government facilities.
---

- |                              |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (iii) Schools?               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (iv) Parks?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

<b>Comment:</b> Project activities would not affect schools, parks, or other public facilities in the area. The project would, however, support several planned and existing mixed use projects (CADA Lofts, Fremont Mews, East End Infill Housing Project). The mixed use projects in the vicinity of the project will provide over 400 units of housing, placing additional demands on existing schools, parks, or other public facilities. Mitigation measures (i.e., development fees, a "green" design) to offset the increased demand on these public facilities are levied by the City as a condition of approval during the design review process, and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Since these projects are not linked with the 13 <sup>th</sup> and 16 <sup>th</sup> Street Station Improvements, there is no impact.
--

**XIV. RECREATION.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Comment:</b> See response to XIII (a) (iii, iv, v).
--

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

(a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Comment:</b> The vision of the R Street Corridor is to create a walkable, transit oriented community center around light rail. Project activities generally focus on improvements to train accessibility for pedestrians to encourage use of mass transit and reduce traffic congestion. Accordingly, there would be no impact to congestion.
--

(c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Comment:</b> Project activities will not affect air traffic patterns.
--

(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**Comment:** The project is compatible with the site's current use as light rail stations and does not include designs that would cause an increase in hazardous conditions. During construction activities, adequate safety measures would be implemented to protect workers and passersby, including the use of safety cones, personnel to direct traffic when needed, signage, lighting, and fencing. Adherence to these measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Comment:** The addition of a ramp at the west end of 16<sup>th</sup> Street Station would create a jog in Whitney Street, however, RT will design the ramp to ensure adequate access for fire trucks. The addition of signage, bus shelters, artwork, and other project elements would not hamper emergency access to the project site. Pursuant to standard construction protocols, emergency personnel would be notified of any complete or partial roadway blockages during construction activities. Adherence to this standard measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

(f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

**Comment:** Project activities focus on improving pedestrian access to the 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail stations. Construction activities will not affect any parking facility.

(g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**Comment:** Through upgrading the pedestrian linkages and light rail station improvements, enhanced transit connections would be enabled, promoting use of mass transit, which supports the City's land use plan for mass transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Comment:</b> Project activities are generally aesthetic in nature and the construction or upgrade of bus shelters. These activities would not significantly affect any water or wastewater treatment facilities nor cause any change in wastewater treatment service provisions.</p> </div>				
(c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Comment:</b> The project would slightly increase impervious area, and would have a negligible effect on surface runoff during a storm event. The project does not require new or an expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities. The impacts of project activities to storm water drainage facilities would be less than significant.</p> </div>				
(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Comment:</b> A municipal provider supplies water to the site. The project would not change demand for drinking water in a manner that would result in a need for new or expanded facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact.</p> </div>				
(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**Comment:** The project site has storm drains (but no sanitary sewers) connected to the City's combined sewer system. Any additional demand on wastewater treatment services due to an increase in the impervious surfaces from the project would be minimal and not significantly add to its current demand of wastewater treatment services.

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Comment:** The project site is served by the Sacramento County Department of Waste Management & Recycling. Any increase in solid waste pursuant to project activities would be minimal and not significantly add to its current demand of solid waste disposal services.

During construction activities, all debris will be disposed of according to the Sacramento County Department of Waste Management & Recycling's guidelines at a permitted landfill. Project activities would comply with regulations related to solid waste. Adherence to these regulations would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Does the project 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**CEQA Environmental Checklist Form**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comment:** Based on the discussion in this Initial Study Checklist, the project would have no impacts on biological resources, less-than-significant effects (with mitigation) on cultural resources, and various impacts (mostly none) to human beings. The project features would be small and entirely localized, and therefore would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

**11. References:**

- California Air Resources Board (ARB). 2002. URBEMIS 2002 Program. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/urbemis/urbemis2002/urbemis2002.htm>.
- California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq. State CEQA Guidelines.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 1999. California Geological Survey.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2005. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. [www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List.cfm).
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2003. Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwyl.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwyl.html).
- City of Sacramento (City). 2005. City of Sacramento Zoning Map Book.
- City of Sacramento (City), Sacramento Regional Transit (RT), Capitol Area Development Authority (CADA). 2005. Proposal to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments for Community Design Funding: 13<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Station Connectivity Improvements.
- Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) 2005. Final Report, Economic Development Strategy: Background Information Report.
- EIP Associates (EIP). 2005. City of Sacramento General Plan Update, Technical Background Report.
- Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. (MIG). 2004. Capitol Area Development Authority, 13<sup>th</sup> Street light Rail Station Design Charette.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2005. Web Soil Survey. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>.
- North Central Information Center (NCIC). 2005. Summary of Results for Records Search. NCIC File No.: SAC-05-230.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 1994. Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2004. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. 2005. [www.airquality.org](http://www.airquality.org).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 1998. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map. [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov).

**12. List of Preparers:**

Gene Moir, Sr. Environmental Compliance Analyst (Regional Transit)

David Solomon, Senior Architect (Regional Transit)

Matt Franck, Planner (CH2M HILL)

Mieke Sheffield, Planner (CH2M HILL)