

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: Cornerstone

Responsible Entity: Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency

Certifying Officer Name and Title: La Shelle Dozier, Executive Director, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency

Consultant (if applicable): Environmental Science Associates

Direct Comments to: Stephanie Green, Environmental Coordinator, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency, 801 12th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, sgreen@shra.org.

Project Location: The property is located at the southern terminus of Lang Avenue and 46th Street in the South Sacramento community of unincorporated Sacramento County. Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-0011-013-0000.

See **Figures 1** and **2**.

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The proposed project is the construction and operation of an affordable housing development on a currently undeveloped approximately 7.1-acre property located at the southern terminus of Lang Avenue and 46th Street in the South Sacramento community of unincorporated Sacramento County (Figures 1 and 2).



SOURCE: County of Sacramento, 2020

Cornerstone

Figure 1
Regional Location





SOURCE: Salazar Architect, Inc., 2020

Cornerstone

Figure 2
Proposed Site Plan



The proposed project includes development of 18 lots for single-family residential units on approximately 3.6 acres on the eastern portion of the property under the sponsorship of Habitat for Humanity of Greater Sacramento, and two lots for 108 affordable multifamily units on approximately 3.5 gross acres on the western portion of the property under the sponsorship of Mutual Housing of California.

The proposed project represents a joint effort between Habitat for Humanity of Greater Sacramento and Mutual Housing of California, and for the purposes of this Environmental Assessment is evaluated as a single project. A summary of project elements is provided in **Table 1** and **Table 2** below.

**TABLE 1
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY AT CORNERSTONE LAND USE SUMMARY**

Proposed Uses	Affordable single-family housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-story detached single-family homes • 2-story detached single-family homes
Unit Summary	18 units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 three-bedroom (72%) • 5 four-bedroom (28%)
Parking	36 spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 covered standard spaces • 18 open-air standard spaces

**TABLE 2
MUTUAL HOUSING AT CORNERSTONE LAND USE SUMMARY**

Proposed Uses	Affordable multifamily housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-story walkup apartments Community building (1-story)
Unit Summary	108 units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 one-bedroom (22%) • 54 two-bedroom (50%) • 30 three-bedroom (28%)
Parking	111 vehicle spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 standard • 3 accessible • 55 compact • 3 motorcycle 121 Class II bike racks
Residential Amenity Space	3,342 gross square feet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community room with shared kitchen • community development office • case manager's office • public restrooms • manager's office • multipurpose room • two laundry rooms

The proposed project required the following County approvals:

- Tentative subdivision map to divide an approximately 7.1-gross-acre, split-zoned parcel into 18 lots for single-family residential uses on approximately 3.6 gross acres in the Residential 5 (RD-5) zone and two lots for 108 affordable apartment units on approximately 3.5 gross acres in the Residential 20 (RD-20) zoning district.
- Special development permit to allow the following:
 - Deviation from the minimum setback required from residentially zoned or property used for residential purposes
 - Deviation from the required landscape screening north of the trash enclosure.
- Design Review to deviate from minimum covered parking spaces requirements and to comply with the Countywide Design Guidelines.
- A State Density Bonus to allow for 108 affordable units and for the following incentives:
 - Deviation from minimum building setbacks (front, rear, and side street).
 - Deviation from the required minimum parking spaces.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

Sacramento County (along with all other cities and counties in the state) must plan to accommodate its share of the housing need of persons at all income levels. Under California law (California Government Code Section 65584), new housing construction need is determined, at a minimum, through a regional housing allocation process. The fair-share process begins with a regional allocation from the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) then determines what share of the regional allocation will be met by each of its member cities and counties, including Sacramento County. The County's share of regional housing need, or the County's Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA), is based on SACOG's Regional Housing Needs Plan.

Under this plan, and as stated in the 2013-2021 Housing Element of the Sacramento County General Plan, Sacramento County was required to plan for and accommodate 13,844 new housing units between 2013 and 2021. Of these 13,844 housing units, 22.7 percent (3,149 units) were required to be affordable to extremely low-income (ELI) and very low-income (VLI) households earning less than 50 percent of the Sacramento County median income, 15.9 percent (2,208 units) affordable to low-income (LI) households earning less than 80 percent of the median, 18.6 percent (2,574 units) to moderate-income (MI) households earning 80 to 120 percent of median income, and 42.7 percent (5,913 units) to above moderate-income (AMI) households earning more than 120 percent of median income.

The proposed project would support the County's objective to add new affordable housing. The proposed project would provide 126 affordable housing units, which would satisfy a portion of the County's identified affordable housing needs.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The project site is not developed and is actively managed for vegetation abatement for fire control purposes. Adjacent land uses include a mixture of residential properties of single-family homes and apartment complexes, Nicholas County Park, and State Route 99 (SR-99). The primary land use within the immediate region consists of residential and commercial development. Topography of the project site is relatively level with elevations ranging from 23 to 27 feet above mean sea level.

Approximately 3.6 acres on the eastern portion of the project site is designated in the Sacramento County Zoning code as RD-5, and approximately 3.5 gross acres on the western portion of the project site is designated as RD-20. RD-5 is the most widely used single-family residential zoning district in the County. Minimum interior lot sizes are 5,200 square feet and corner lots 6,200 square feet. Duplexes are permitted with a minimum lot size of 8,500 square feet on corner lots and subject to the issuance of a use permit. Incidental agricultural uses are permitted on lots of 20,000 square feet or larger. Certain types of business and professional office uses when in scale and oriented to neighborhood and convenience centers are subject to issuance of a use permit.

RD-20 is a multifamily zoning district with maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. Single-family interior lots require 4,000 square feet, and corner lots require 5,200 square feet. Duplexes are permitted on minimum 7,200-square-foot corner lots and on interior lots of 6,200 square feet. Multifamily projects are permitted on minimum 6,200-square-foot corner lots and on interior lots of 5,200 square feet. Minimum lot width and public street frontage is 52 feet.

California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

California law requires that local lead agencies review and disclose the environmental impacts of discretionary actions that are proposed within their jurisdictions (California Public Resources Code 21000-21189 and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387). In fulfillment of that requirement, the County of Sacramento prepared a Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the project and circulated the document for public review. The Draft IS/MND was circulated between November 9, 2020 and December 9, 2020. The County considered the comments received on the Draft IS/MND and the project was approved on January 11, 2021. Much of the analysis contained within the IS/MND is directly applicable to this Environmental Assessment (EA), and the IS/MND and its associated technical studies are incorporated as principal sources to this EA.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
M20DC060211	HOME	2,752,000
NA	Project Based Vouchers (sixteen 20-year PBVs)	4,251,116

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$7,003,116

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: \$43,589,487

Construction Costs: \$31,503,489
Non-Construction Costs: \$12,085,998
Total: \$43,589,487

Compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Sacramento International Airport is more than 14 miles north of the project site. The project site is well outside the boundaries of the Sacramento International Airport runway protection zones. The project site is outside all other defined safety zones, airspace protection zones, and Airport Influence Areas of the airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan.</p> <p>There are no military airfields in Sacramento County or the nearby vicinity; therefore, no military airfield Airport Protection Zone or Clear Zone would affect the proposed project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 1</p>
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System (CBRS) Units, or CBRS buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982 (PL 97-348), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (PL 101-591) located within Sacramento County. The project site is therefore not located within a CBRS Unit, or a CBRS buffer zone.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 2</p>
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is responsible for delineating areas that are expected to be subject to flooding during a 100-year flood event.</p> <p>A 100-year flood event is defined as the area that is expected to be inundated by flood flows during a rainfall event that would have an annual probability of occurrence of one percent. FEMA refers to the portion of the floodplain or coastal area that is at risk from floods of this magnitude as Special Flood Hazard Areas.</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>FEMA creates and maintains Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) which identify areas located within a 100-year floodplain boundary area.</p> <p>Based on FEMA flood hazard mapping, the project site is within Zone X -- <i>Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee</i>. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area.</p> <p>Source Document(s): Attachment 3</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Sacramento County staff conducted an assessment of potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed project to determine if it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards. <p>The proposed project site is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB’s frequent temperature inversions result in a relatively stable atmosphere that increases the potential for pollution. Within the SVAB, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for ensuring that applicable federal and state emission standards are not violated. Project related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. Moreover, SMAQMD has established significance thresholds to determine if a proposed project’s emission contribution significantly contributes to regional air quality impacts (Table 3).</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations																		
<p style="text-align: center;">TABLE 3: SMAQMD SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">ROG¹ (lbs/day)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">NOx (lbs/day)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">CO (µg/m³)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">PM₁₀ (lbs/day)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">PM_{2.5} (lbs/day)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Construction (short-term)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">None</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> <td style="text-align: center;">CAAQS²</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80^{3*}</td> <td style="text-align: center;">82^{3*}</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational (long-term)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65</td> <td style="text-align: center;">CAAQS</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80^{3*}</td> <td style="text-align: center;">82^{3*}</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 0;"> ¹ Reactive Organic Gas ² California Ambient Air Quality Standards ^{3*} Only applies to projects for which all feasible best available control technology (BACT) and best management practices (BMPs) have been applied. Projects that fail to apply all feasible BACT/BMPs must meet a significance threshold of 0 lbs/day. </p> <p><u>Methodology</u></p> <p>Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. The modeled criteria pollutant emissions were compared to the federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels and local SMAQMD construction and operational thresholds to determine if the proposed project would result in a significant air quality impact.</p> <p><u>Construction Emissions</u></p> <p>Short-term air quality impacts are mostly due to dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) generated by construction and development activities, and emissions from equipment and vehicle engines (NOx) operated during these activities. Dust generation is dependent on soil type and soil moisture, as well as the amount of total acreage actually involved in clearing, grubbing, and grading activities. Clearing and earthmoving activities comprise the major source of construction dust generation, but traffic and general disturbance of the soil also contribute to the problem. Sand, lime, or other fine particulate materials may be used during construction and stored on-site. If not stored properly, such materials could become airborne during periods of high winds. The effects of construction activities include increased dust fall and locally elevated levels of suspended particulates. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are considered unhealthy because the particles are small enough to inhale and damage lung tissue, which can lead to respiratory problems.</p>				ROG ¹ (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	CO (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (lbs/day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs/day)	Construction (short-term)	None	85	CAAQS ²	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}	Operational (long-term)	65	65	CAAQS	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}
	ROG ¹ (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	CO (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (lbs/day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs/day)															
Construction (short-term)	None	85	CAAQS ²	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}															
Operational (long-term)	65	65	CAAQS	80 ^{3*}	82 ^{3*}															

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>																			
		<p>The proposed project’s estimated construction emissions are shown in Table 4.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TABLE 4: CONSTRUCTION-RELATED EMISSION ESTIMATES</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="4">Emissions in pounds per day</th> </tr> <tr> <th>ROG</th> <th>NOx</th> <th>PM₁₀</th> <th>PM_{2.5}</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Thresholds</td> <td>None</td> <td>85</td> <td>80</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Emissions</td> <td>90.56</td> <td>56.70</td> <td>13.58</td> <td>7.95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2</p> <p>As shown in Table 4, construction-related emissions are below thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants.</p> <p><i>Fugitive Dust</i></p> <p>The SMAQMD recommends implementation of their <i>Basic Construction Emission Control Practices</i>, which consists of measures to control fugitive dust. Implementation of these best management practices (BMPs) allows the proposed project to utilize the SMAQMD’s non-zero particulate matter significance threshold. The proposed project would implement these BMPs and effectively control construction-related fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level, as calculated above.</p> <p><u>Operational Emissions</u></p> <p>Once a project is completed, additional pollutants are emitted through the use, or operation, of the site. Land use development projects typically involve the following sources of emissions: motor vehicle trips generated by the land use; fuel combustion from landscape maintenance equipment; natural gas combustion emissions used for space and water heating; evaporative emissions of ROG associated with the use of consumer products; and evaporative emissions of ROG resulting from the application of architectural coatings.</p> <p>The proposed project’s estimated emissions are shown in Table 5.</p>		Emissions in pounds per day				ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	Thresholds	None	85	80	82	Estimated Emissions	90.56	56.70	13.58	7.95
	Emissions in pounds per day																				
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}																	
Thresholds	None	85	80	82																	
Estimated Emissions	90.56	56.70	13.58	7.95																	

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>																			
		<p style="text-align: center;">TABLE 5: CALEEMOD OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="padding: 5px;">Operational Year 2022</th> <th colspan="4" style="padding: 5px;">Criteria pollutants in pounds per day</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="padding: 5px;">ROG</th> <th style="padding: 5px;">NOx</th> <th style="padding: 5px;">PM₁₀</th> <th style="padding: 5px;">PM_{2.5}</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Thresholds</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">65</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">85</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">80</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">82</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Operational (long-term)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">5.21</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">6.96</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">5.02</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">1.44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">As shown in Table 5, operational emissions are below thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants.</p> <p><u>Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels</u></p> <p>Sacramento County is designated under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as severe nonattainment for 8-hour ozone, moderate nonattainment for PM_{2.5}, and maintenance for CO and PM₁₀. Federal de minimis levels for each of these pollutants would be 25 tons/year for ozone precursors (VOCs or NOx) and 100 tons/year for PM_{2.5}, CO, and PM₁₀. Ozone is a secondary pollutant created by NOx, VOCs, and sunlight, thus the thresholds are based on the precursors described above. A conformity determination would be required for each criteria or precursor exceeding the federal General Conformity de minimis level. However, emissions of ozone precursors (VOC's or NOx), PM_{2.5}, CO, and PM₁₀ from construction would be well below the federal General Conformity de minimis levels pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act, so a conformity determination for construction-related emissions is not required.</p> <p>Operational emissions would also be below the federal de minimis level of 25 tons per year for ozone precursors (VOCs or NOx) and 100 tons per year for PM_{2.5}, CO, and PM₁₀. Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from General Conformity regulations.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 2</p>	Operational Year 2022	Criteria pollutants in pounds per day				ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	Thresholds	65	85	80	82	Operational (long-term)	5.21	6.96	5.02	1.44
Operational Year 2022	Criteria pollutants in pounds per day																				
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}																	
Thresholds	65	85	80	82																	
Operational (long-term)	5.21	6.96	5.02	1.44																	
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located within a Coastal Zone Management Area or a county or local area of jurisdiction, which includes the first 100 feet shoreward as defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 4</p>																			

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Geocon Consultants, Inc. (Geocon) prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project site. The discussion below summarizes their efforts and findings.</p> <p><u>Methodology</u></p> <p>Geocon researched a variety of federal, state, tribal, and local databases and directories to determine if any recognized environmental conditions (RECs) had been recorded on or near the project site. Additionally, Geocon staff conducted a pedestrian-level survey of the site.</p> <p><u>Findings</u></p> <p>Geocon’s research did not identify any known RECs on the project site. Similarly, the pedestrian survey did not identify any evidence of hazardous materials on the site. The research returned several RECs within a ¼-mile of the site. All records could be attributed to inactive facilities that previously handled hazardous materials, but Geocon concluded that the chance of impact to the site from these facilities were low, mostly due to lack of reported releases or violations from the facilities.</p> <p>The State Water Resource’s Control Board’s GeoTracker and the California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control’s Envirostor databases did not identify any records on or within ¼-mile of the project site. The report did not identify any evidence of RECs on the project site or adjoining properties.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Based on the results of the Phase I ESA, the project site does not contain hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals, or other hazards that could affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 5</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Biological Resources Assessment</u></p> <p>Analytical Environmental Services (AES) prepared a biological resources assessment for the proposed project. AES reviewed and analyzed a variety of data from state and federal agencies. A list of special-status species known or with potential to occur on the project site or in the immediate vicinity was developed from database queries of the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare Plant Inventory.</p> <p>AES staff performed two pedestrian surveys of the site, in November 2019 and February 2020.</p> <p><u>South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan</u></p> <p>The South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is a regional approach to addressing development, habitat conservation, and agricultural lands within the south Sacramento County region. The SSHCP covers 28 different species of plants and wildlife, including 10 that are state and/or federally-listed as threatened or endangered. The SSHCP has been developed as a collaborative effort to streamline permitting and protect covered species habitat.</p> <p>On May 15, 2018, the Final SSHCP and EIS/EIR was published in the federal Register for a 30-day review period. Public hearings on the proposed adoption of the final SSHCP, final EIS/EIR, final Aquatic Resources Plan (ARP), and final Implementation Agreement (IA) began in August 2018, and adoption by the County occurred on September 11, 2018. The permit was received on June 12, 2019 from the USFWS; July 25, 2019 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); and August 20, 2019 from the CDFW.</p> <p>The proposed project is in the Urban Development Area (UDA) designated under the SSHCP and considered a covered activity in the SSHCP. Therefore, the proposed project’s design and construction must comply with all SSHCP requirements, including SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>(AMMs). The SSHCP is a habitat-based plan in which mitigation fees are based on impacts to habitat or land cover rather than impacts to individual species.</p> <p><u>Special Status Species</u></p> <p>The likelihood of a special status species to be present on the project site was determined based on the records search and surveys described above. Species considered for presence are those species with modeled habitat identified in the SSHCP and species considered with potential occurrence as indicated on the official USFWS species list, CNDDDB quad queries (Florin & Elk Grove US Geological Survey 7.5-minute quadrangles), CNPS queries.</p> <p>Special Status Plant Species</p> <p><i>Sanford's Arrowhead</i></p> <p>The biological resources investigation determined that Sanford's arrowhead is the only special status plant species with a potential to occur onsite. Sanford's arrowhead (<i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>) occurs in emergent marsh habitats, including habitats which are modified or human-made. Sanford's arrowhead is designated as a federal species of special concern and is listed by the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants as category 1B.2 (i.e., rare throughout its range in California with a moderate probability of going extinct). Sanford's is fairly common in the Sacramento area. Potential suitable marsh habitats include the margins of rivers, streams, ponds, reservoirs, irrigation and drainage canals and ditches, and stock-ponds. In order to avoid impacts to the species, appropriate habitat must be avoided or a survey must be performed demonstrating that the species is not present.</p> <p>A manmade ditch located at the northern portion of the project site provides marginal habitat for the species. While the plant was not seen during floristic surveys, both surveys were conducted outside of the evident and identifiable bloom period. The nearest CNDDDB occurrence, is located within a concrete-channelized section of Morrison Creek, approximately 0.40 miles south of the site.</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to rare plant species would not be significant.</p> <p>Special Status Wildlife Species</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that the following special status wildlife species have the potential to occur on the project site.</p> <p><i>Burrowing Owl</i></p> <p>According to the CDFW life history account for the species, burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>) habitat can be found in annual and perennial grasslands, deserts, and arid scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Burrows are the essential component of burrowing owl habitat. Both natural and artificial burrows provide protection, shelter, and nesting sites for burrowing owls. Burrowing owls typically use burrows made by fossorial mammals, such as ground squirrels or badgers, but also use human-made structures such as cement culverts; cement, asphalt, or wood debris piles; or openings beneath cement or asphalt pavement. Burrowing owls are listed as a California Species of Special Concern due to loss of breeding habitat. The proposed project construction staging areas contain valley grasslands, which provide suitable habitat for burrowing owl.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to burrowing owl would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Ferruginous Hawk</i></p> <p>This species forages in large, open tracts of grasslands, sparse scrubland, and deserts. It frequents open grasslands, sagebrush flats, desert scrub, low foothills and surrounding valleys, and fringes of pinyon-juniper habitats. Nesting occurs in lone trees or on telephone poles. Prey includes lagomorphs, ground squirrels, and mice, although it will also take birds, reptiles, and</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>amphibians. This species is not known to breed in California; however, the species may forage within habitat on-site.</p> <p>Valley grassland on the project site provides suitable foraging habitat and nesting habitat. There are two CNDDDB records in the search area. The closest record, from 2003, is located approximately 3.63 miles southwest of the site.</p> <p>Potential nesting habitat is provided by trees on-site and the surrounding properties to the south. Development of the project site would result in a loss of foraging habitat (valley grassland) and potential nesting habitat.</p> <p>With participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the AMMs for raptors, impacts to ferruginous hawk are considered less than significant.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to ferruginous hawk would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Loggerhead Shrike</i></p> <p>According to the California Fish and Wildlife Life History Account for the loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>), the species breeds mainly in shrublands or open woodlands with a fair amount of grass cover and areas of bare ground. They require tall shrubs or trees (they also use fences or power lines) for hunting perches, territorial advertisement, and pair maintenance; open areas of short grasses, forbs, or bare ground for hunting; and large shrubs or trees for nest placement. They also need impaling sites for prey manipulation or storage, which can include sharp, thorny, or multi-stemmed plants and barbed-wire fences. The breeding season for this species begins in mid-March to early April and extends to July. The species is listed as a California Species of Special Concern due to loss of nesting habitat.</p> <p>Valley grassland on the project site provides suitable foraging habitat and potential nesting habitat along the southern property boundaries. There are no known CNDDDB records of loggerhead shrike in Sacramento County; however, this species is frequently</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>observed in open grasslands in the Central Valley, including portions of Sacramento County.</p> <p>Development of the project site would result in potential nesting and foraging habitat for the species. Compliance with the SSHCP AMMs for raptors will be required. Although the species is not a raptor, it is grouped in with the raptor AMMs because of its use of impaling sites.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to loggerhead shrike would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Swainson’s Hawk</i></p> <p>The Swainson’s hawk (<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>) is listed as a threatened species by the state and is a covered species under the SSHCP. It is a migratory raptor typically nesting in or near valley floor riparian habitats during spring and summer months. Swainson’s hawks were once common throughout the state, but various habitat changes, including the loss of nesting habitat (trees) and the loss of foraging habitat through the conversion of native Central Valley grasslands to certain incompatible agricultural and urban uses has caused an estimated 90 percent decline in their population.</p> <p>There are 47 CNDDDB occurrences of this species within the search area conducted for the biological resources evaluation. The closest occurrence (from 2015) is located approximately 1.54 miles southeast of the project site.</p> <p>Suitable habitat is present for nesting and foraging on and near the project site. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in the loss of potential foraging habitat.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs for raptors, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to Swainson’s hawk would not be significant.</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p><i>White-Tailed Kite</i></p> <p>The White-tailed kite is a CDFW fully protected species. White-tailed kites occur in herbaceous and open stages of most habitats in cismontane California. Areas with substantial groves of dense, broad-leaved deciduous trees are used for nesting and roosting. They also roost in saltgrass and Bermuda grass in southern California. White-tailed kite breeds from February to October, with peak activity from May to August. Nests are typically located from 20 to 100 feet above the ground near the top of dense oak, willow, or other tree stands, and are often located near an open foraging area with a dense population of voles.</p> <p>Large trees on the project site could potentially provide nesting habitat. There are two known CNDDDB records within the search area. The closest record (from 1990) is located 1.50 miles northeast of the project site. The valley grasslands on-site provide potential foraging habitat.</p> <p>Development of the project site would result in a loss of potential nesting and foraging habitat for the species.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs for raptors, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to white-tailed kite would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Pallid Bat and Western Red Bat</i></p> <p>Pallid bat (<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>) is a state-listed Species of Special Concern. This species is commonly found in grasslands, agricultural fields, and desert habitat. The species can be found roosting within natural or man-made structures, such as rock crevices, caves, mine shafts, under bridges, in buildings and tree hollows.</p> <p>Western red bat (<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i>) is a state-listed Species of Special Concern. This species roost primarily in trees along edge habitats adjacent to streams, fields, or urban areas. The species can be found within either natural or human-made structures, such as caves, mines, crevices (including under bridges), hollow trees, and in abandoned or seldom-used buildings. Young are born to the</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>species in the spring and early summer (maternity colonies typically begin to form in April, and births occur from May through early July). Threats to the species include loss of foraging and roosting habitat, and disruption of maternity colonies.</p> <p>There are no known occurrences of these bat species within five miles of the project site. However, suitable foraging habitat is present in and adjacent to the project area, including in culverts running under SR-99, in trees, and in other structures around the project site. Proposed tree and vegetation removal could impact roosting bats. Western red bat is the only covered bat species within the SSHCP.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable AMMs, as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to bats would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Migratory Nesting Birds</i></p> <p>The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which states “unless and except as permitted by regulations, it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill” a migratory bird. Section 3(18) of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) defines the term “take” as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Causing a bird to abandon an active nest may cause harm to egg(s) or chick(s) and is therefore considered “take.” Suitable tree habitat is present throughout the project site and adjacent properties. Construction activities during nesting season (February 15 through September 15) could disturb birds nesting within 500 feet of the project site.</p> <p>The biological resources assessment determined that implementation of Mitigation Measure C, Migratory Bird Nest Protection, would ensure impacts to migratory nesting birds would not be significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3 and 6</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project does not involve explosive or flammable materials or operations. There is no visual evidence or indication of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at or immediately adjacent to the project site. There would be no impacts related to explosive and flammable hazards.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 5</p>
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is not in an area of agricultural production. Important Farmland, including prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance regulated under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq, implementing regulations 7 CFR Part 658, of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, as amended) does not occur on or in the vicinity of the project site.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>As discussed above under <i>Flood Insurance</i>, based on FEMA flood mapping, the project site is within Zone X — <i>Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee</i>. Based on this designation, the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in impacts to floodplains and would not result in direct or indirect support of floodplain development.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Analytical Environmental Services (AES) conducted a cultural resources investigation for the proposed project. The investigation included a records search completed on December 3, 2019 by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) at Sacramento State University (NCIC File No.: SAC-19-226), a review of pertinent literature and historic maps, a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands files, and a field survey. The records search included, but was not necessarily restricted to, a review of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, historical marker listings, Sacramento County resource listings, and historic maps. No cultural resources were identified within the project area of potential effects (APE) or within ½-mile.</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>A total of five archaeological surveys have been completed within ½ mile of the APE. None included any portion of the APE, and no cultural resources have been identified within ½-mile of the APE.</p> <p>An AES senior archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology, conducted a cultural resources field survey of the APE on December 4, 2019, using parallel pedestrian transects spaced no more than 15 meters apart. Ground surface visibility averaged less than 15 percent even though the property had been mowed recently. Two small (less than 3 feet in diameter) depressions and a fractured, low concrete pad were identified. There is nothing on the ground that would hint at a use for the depressions or the concrete slab. The site has been thoroughly disturbed, with some soil mounding near the edges. A consistent modern debris scatter was observed throughout the APE, and small-scale dumping was evident, including piles of concrete.</p> <p>Neither the records search nor the field survey resulted in the identification of any significant cultural resources within the APE.</p> <p>AES sent a records search request to the NAHC on November 20, 2019. A reply was received on November 25, 2019. The NAHC did not find any records in the Sacred Lands Files but included a list of individuals who might have information regarding cultural resources on the APE.</p> <p>Under coordination between SHRA and Sacramento County formal notification letters were sent on July 7, 2020 to tribes identified by the NAHC. Responses were received from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) and the Wilton Rancheria.</p> <p>The UAIC stated that they were not aware of any tribal cultural resources on or near the project site, and requested that unanticipated discovery mitigation be incorporated into the project. No further consultation was requested.</p> <p>The Wilton Rancheria requested consultation on July 29, 2020, via email. Representatives from the tribe indicated they are not aware of any tribal cultural resources on the project site, but did disclose that the project site is located near a known site of cultural</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>significance. In order to avoid construction-related impacts to potential unknown tribal cultural resources, they have requested that unanticipated discovery mitigation be incorporated.</p> <p>Accordingly, Mitigation Measure D, Unanticipated Discoveries, would be implemented to ensure impacts related to inadvertent discovery of cultural or tribal resources or human remains would not be significant</p> <p>The cultural resources investigation concluded that as a result of the records search and field study, no significant prehistoric or historic-period cultural resources were identified, and a finding of No Historic Properties Affected was recommended.</p> <p>SHRA consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Title 54 U.S.C. 306108), as amended.</p> <p>On February 25, 2021, the SHPO provided concurrence with the finding of No Historic Properties Affected.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 7, 8</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Noise Guidebook provides minimum national standards applicable to HUD programs to protect citizens against excessive noise in their communities and places of residence (Article 51.101(a)). Article 51.101(a)(8) of the Noise Guidebook establishes a 65 dB Ldn exterior noise level criterion as acceptable and allowable for outdoor activity areas of new residential projects. Article 51.101(a)(9) of the Noise Guidebook establishes a 45 dB Ldn interior noise level criterion as acceptable and allowable for new residential projects.</p> <p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>Project construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact would not be significant due to the temporary nature of these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code). Therefore, project-related construction</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>activities would comply with the Sacramento County Code and construction noise impacts would not be adverse.</p> <p><u>Operational Noise</u></p> <p>Bollard Acoustical Associates, Inc. (Bollard) prepared an environmental noise assessment for the proposed project. The Federal Highway Administration Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108) was used to predict traffic noise levels at the project site. The model is based upon the California Vehicle Noise (CALVENO) emission factors for automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site.</p> <p>Bollard conducted traffic noise level measurements at the project site on November 15, 2019. Concurrent SR-99 traffic noise level measurements were conducted during the survey. The measurements were conducted at heights of 5, 10, and 15 feet above existing ground elevation at the location of the nearest building facades to SR-99 to quantify differences in traffic noise levels at the future first, second, and third floor facades of the development. The intent of the noise level measurements was to determine the project noise exposure from SR-99 and to provide noise reduction recommendations where necessary.</p> <p>The study determined that future exterior traffic noise levels at the primary outdoor activity areas of the residences proposed nearest to SR-99 would be approximately 61 dBA Ldn. This predicted level satisfies the Sacramento County and HUD 65 dB Ldn requirement applicable to new residential developments. As a result, no additional noise mitigation would be required for the outdoor activity areas developed as part of the proposed project.</p> <p>The study determined that future exterior traffic noise levels at the nearest building facades are predicted to vary depending on the height of the façade above ground. For example, third floor façade noise levels would be approximately 9 dB higher than first floor façade levels due to reduced shielding of SR 99 traffic noise by the intervening 14-foot-tall soundwall. As a result, varying degrees of building façade noise exposure would be required to ensure compliance with the Sacramento County and</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>HUD interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn. Specifically, building façade noise reductions of 24, 28, and 33 dBA would be required of first, second, and third floor facades to meet that standard. Bollard recommended an additional 3 dB of building façade noise reduction beyond the minimum required to satisfy the noise standard.</p> <p>Standard residential construction (e.g., stucco siding, windows with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of STC-27, door weather-stripping, exterior wall insulation, composition plywood roof), results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of at least 25 dB with windows closed and approximately 15 dB with windows open. Therefore, standard construction practices would not be adequate for this development. In order to satisfy the County and HUD 45 dBA Ldn interior noise level standard with a margin of safety, construction upgrades would be required for the exterior facades of this development proposed on close proximity to SR-99.</p> <p>The study determined that implementation of Mitigation Measure A, 45 dB Interior Noise Reductions, would ensure that the project meets Sacramento County and HUD interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant roadway noise and operational noise impacts.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3, 9</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not served by a U.S. EPA designated sole-source aquifer, is not located within a sole source aquifer watershed, and would not affect a sole-source aquifer. The project site would be entirely served by the existing municipal water supply.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 10</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>AES prepared a biological resources evaluation for the proposed project, which included an aquatic resources inventory. AES staff performed surveys for aquatic resources in November 2019 and February 2020. AES surveyed the project site and vicinity using the United States U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Arid West Region Supplement) standards to determine absence/presence of wetlands. The surveys identified one aquatic feature, a 300-foot-long, man-made ditch located near the northern property boundary. The feature transverses the site from east to west, but no longer has any hydrological connections up or downstream. Surveys did not find any positive indicators for any of the three parameters (vegetation, soils, and hydrology) needed to classify a feature as a wetland and therefore, is unlikely to be classified as waters of the U.S. However, the feature may still be classified as water of the State of California and would be classified as a stream/creek feature under the South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP). If the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) determines the feature constitutes a water of the State, the project applicant would need to submit a Report of Waste Discharge for the filling of the stream feature, to the RWQCB. This submission would serve as an application for a signed Notice of Applicability for coverage under a General Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) that would be needed prior to authorization under the SSHCP. Additionally, since the project would result in the permanent filling of the 0.03-acre feature, it would require compensation through payment of SSHCP Development Fees for Stream/Creek land cover type. Sacramento County has determined that participation in the SSHCP as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to wetlands would not be significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3 and 6</p>

<p>Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The American River is designated as a recreational river under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act from the confluence with the Sacramento River to Nimbus Dam, located east of the city of Sacramento. However, the project site is in the South Sacramento community of unincorporated Sacramento County approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the nearest portion of the American River. The proposed project would not have a direct and adverse effect within wild and scenic river boundaries; invade the area or unreasonably diminish the river outside wild and scenic river boundaries; or have an adverse effect on the natural, cultural, and/or recreational values of the wild and scenic river.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 11</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</p>		
<p>Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The property is located at the southern terminus of Lang Avenue and 46th Street, approximately 0.3 mile south of 47th Avenue, in the South Sacramento community of unincorporated Sacramento County. The project site is not developed. Adjacent land uses include a mixture of residential properties of single-family homes and apartment complexes, Nicholas County Park, and SR-99. The primary land use within the immediate region consists of residential and commercial development.</p> <p>The project site is located in Census Tract 47.02 as identified in the 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) of the U.S. Census Bureau. Within this tract, approximately 88 percent of the population is comprised of ethnic minorities, and approximately 32.8 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line. The project area is therefore considered to have an environmental justice population based upon the higher rate of minority and low income populations.</p> <p>The proposed project would provide 126 affordable housing units, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. As analyzed in this EA, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area.</p> <p>From the consideration of regulatory factors in this EA, a number of environmental topics were identified to generate</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>potential effects requiring mitigation, including construction-related fugitive dust emissions, potential impacts sensitive plant and wildlife species or their habitat, potential impacts to subsurface cultural resources, and construction and operational noise impacts. However, impacts would be shared by neighboring non-environmental justice populations, and thus do not represent impacts with the potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population.</p> <p>Overall, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts that would create permanent adverse effects in the project area to existing populations, or to an introduced environmental justice population. Provision of affordable housing units would result in a beneficial impact by providing housing for low-income populations.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 12</p>

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27] Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor adverse impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification, which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
<p>Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The project site is not developed and is actively managed for vegetation abatement for fire control purposes. Adjacent land uses include a mixture of residential properties of single-family homes and apartment complexes, Nicholas County Park, and SR-99. The primary land use within the immediate vicinity consists of residential and commercial development.</p> <p>Approximately 3.6 acres on the eastern portion of the project site is designated in the Sacramento County Zoning code as RD-5, and approximately 3.5 gross acres on the western portion of the project site is designated as RD-20.</p> <p>RD-5 is the most widely used single-family residential zoning district in the county. Minimum interior lot sizes are 5,200 square feet and corner lots are 6,200 square feet. Duplexes are permitted with a minimum lot size of 8,500 square feet on corner lots and subject to the issuance of a use permit. Certain types of business and professional office uses when in scale and oriented to neighborhood and convenience centers are subject to issuance of a use permit.</p> <p>RD-20 is a multifamily zoning district with maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. Single-family interior lots require 4,000 square feet, and corner lots require 5,200 square feet. Duplexes are permitted on minimum 7,200-square-foot corner lots and on interior lots of 6,200 square feet. Multifamily projects are permitted on minimum 6,200-square-foot corner lots and on interior lots of 5,200 square feet. Minimum lot width and public street frontage is 52 feet.</p> <p>The proposed project is the construction and operation of an affordable housing development on a currently undeveloped approximately 7.1-acre property located in the South Sacramento community of unincorporated Sacramento County. The proposed project includes development of 18 lots for single-family residential units on approximately 3.6 acres on the eastern portion of the property, and two lots for 108 affordable multifamily units on approximately 3.5 gross acres on the western portion of the property.</p> <p>Required Sacramento County approvals for the proposed project include issuance of Special Development Permit to allow deviation from the minimum setback required from residentially-zoned or property used for residential purposes and deviation from the required landscape screening north of the trash enclosure; Design Review to deviate from minimum covered parking spaces requirements and to comply with the</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
		<p>Countywide Design Guidelines; and a State Density Bonus to allow for 108 affordable units, deviation from minimum building setbacks (front, rear, and side street), and deviation from the required minimum parking spaces.</p> <p>The Sacramento County Office of Planning and Environmental Review has determined that with issuance of the aforementioned approvals, completion of required environmental reviews and implementation required mitigation measures, and compliance with all applicable laws and regulations the project is consistent with environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, South Sacramento Community Plan, and Sacramento County Zoning Code. Consequently, the proposed project would be in conformance with applicable plans and would be compatible with land use and zoning, scale, and urban design.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>Compliance with the County’s Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance would reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	3	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>Hazardous materials are described above in the section titled <i>Contamination and Toxic Substances</i>. Based on the results of the Phase I ESA, the project site does not contain hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals or other hazards that could affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Noise as discussed above in the section titled <i>Noise Abatement and Control</i>. Project construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact would not be significant due to the temporary nature of these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).</p> <p>The noise study prepared for the proposed project determined that future traffic noise levels at portions of the proposed project closest to SR-99</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
		could exceed Sacramento County and HUD interior noise thresholds of 45 dBA Ldn. Implementation of Mitigation Measure A, 45 dB Interior Noise Reductions , would ensure that the project meets Sacramento County and HUD interior noise level standards. Source Document(s): 3, 5, 9
Energy Consumption	2	The project would meet current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Other than natural gas and coal fuel used to generate the electricity for the project, the project would not have a substantial effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource. Source Document(s): 3

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The proposed project is a residential development and does not include employment-generating uses (e.g. commercial, retail, office). Construction of the proposed project would result in temporary construction jobs that would be anticipated to be filled by local workers. The proposed project would neither significantly increase or decrease temporary and/or permanent employment opportunities. Source Document(s): 3
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	The proposed project would support the County's objective to add new affordable housing. The proposed project would provide 126 affordable housing units, which would satisfy a portion of the County's identified affordable housing needs. The project site is undeveloped and no displacement of housing or jobs would occur with implementation of the proposed project. As the proposed project is consistent with the planned use of the site, no adverse demographic changes are anticipated. Source Document(s): 3

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The proposed project is consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan land use designations and zoning for the project site. Consequently, population generated by the proposed project was factored into the analysis of impacts to educational and cultural facilities in General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. The project would result in minor increases to student population. However, the increase would not require the construction/expansion of new unplanned school facilities.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The project site is located in close proximity to numerous neighborhood-serving commercial and retail uses, including personal services, restaurants, houseware and apparel shops, and health and fitness clubs. Given the project’s location with an established community, there would be adequate and convenient access to essential items such as food, medicine, banks, and other convenience shopping services that would meet the needs of the project occupants.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>Nearby medical and social service facilities include UC Davis Medical Center 3.5 miles north of the project site, Methodist Hospital of Sacramento 3.5 miles south of the project site, and Lutheran Social Services of Northern California 0.5 mile north of the project site. Access to these and other medical and social service facilities would be provided by personal vehicle, rideshare, or by light rail or bus services available in close proximity to project site. The project occupants would have adequate access to hospitals, emergency facilities, and social services.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>The Sacramento County Department of Waste Management and Recycling provides garbage pickup and recycling for residential customers in the project area.</p> <p>The Sacramento County Kiefer Landfill is the primary location for the disposal of waste in Sacramento County. The Kiefer Landfill is expected to be able to provide service to the county, including the proposed project, without the need for new expansion beyond that already planned, until the year 2050.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Wastewater / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has confirmed that the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District has adequate wastewater treatment and disposal capacity to service the proposed project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>The Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) provides water supply services to the project site. The Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has confirmed that the SCWA adequate capacity and supply to serve the water needs of the proposed project.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p>The project would incrementally increase demand for police, fire, and emergency medical services. The Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has confirmed that the project would be adequately served by existing police, fire, and medical services and facilities, and implementation of the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse physical impacts as a result of providing adequate service.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>The project site is served by Nicholas County Park, immediately adjacent to and northeast of the project site. The park includes a large open space area, baseball field, and playground. The project would result in an incremental increased demand for park and recreation services, but the Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has determined that meeting this demand would not result in any substantial physical impacts.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>The Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has determined that the proposed project does not conflict with transportation policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, with the Sacramento Regional Transit Master Plan, or other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting transportation.</p> <p>The project would be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
		<p>The project site is located within 0.5-mile of bus stops located on 47th Avenue. The project would not provide more than the minimum number of required parking spaces. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are proposed as part of the project and therefore would not adversely impact either mode of transportation.</p> <p>The project would not result in significant impacts related to transportation and accessibility.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	3	<p>There are unique natural features on or in the vicinity of the project site. As discussed in the <i>Wetlands</i> portion of this EA, AES prepared a biological resources evaluation for the proposed project, which included an aquatic resources inventory. The surveys identified one aquatic feature, a 300-foot long, man-made ditch located near the northern property boundary. The feature transverses the site from east to west, but no longer has any hydrological connections up or downstream. If the feature is determined to a water of the state, Sacramento County has determined that participation in the South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP), as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, would ensure impacts to wetlands would not be significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3 and 6</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	3	<p>The project site is not developed and is actively managed for vegetation abatement for fire control purposes. As discussed in the <i>Endangered Species</i> portion of this EA, the biological resources assessment prepared for the proposed project determined that the implementation of the proposed project could result in adverse impact to sensitive plant species and wildlife species and their habitat. The Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review has determined that the project's required participation in the SSHCP and compliance with the applicable</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
		<p>SSHCP avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs), as required in Mitigation Measure B, Compliance with the SSHCP, and Mitigation Measure C, Migratory Bird Nest Protection, would ensure impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species would not be significant.</p> <p>Source Document(s): 3 and 6</p>
Other Factors	3	<p><u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></p> <p>The SMAQMD has established a numeric GHG threshold of significance of 1,100 MTCO₂e for both construction and operational project phases. The SMAQMD <i>Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County</i> states “lead agencies shall estimate and present a projects’ construction GHG emissions for each year of construction” and “lead agencies shall estimate and present a project’s annual operational GHG emissions in the first year of full operation.”</p> <p>Consistent with SMAQMD guidance, GHG emissions from construction and operational phases were compared to the District’s 1,100 MTCO₂e per year threshold of significance.</p> <p>CalEEMod (version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate construction- and operational-related GHG emissions resulting from the project to determine if it would exceed the SMAQMD threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e per year. Model results indicate that total GHG emissions from construction would be approximately 322.23 MTCO₂e. Consequently, GHG emissions resulting from both project construction and operation would be below the threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e per year. Therefore, GHG emissions of the proposed project would be less than significant.</p> <p>In addition, the project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure E, 20 Percent of Parking to be EV Ready, which, in accordance with Best Management Practice (BMP) 2 of SMAQMD Tier 1 BMPs for greenhouse gas thresholds, the developer shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a minimum of one EV Ready parking space per single-family unit; and • 20 percent of the total number of parking spaces for the multi-family dwellings shall be constructed to an EV Ready level. <p>Source Document(s): 3</p>

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. January 2013, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed by Geocon Consultants, Inc.

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

1. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), 2013. *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/smf_alucp_all_adopted_dec_2013.pdf?1456339912, accessed September 11, 2019. Accessed December 10, 2020.
2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2018. Results of Coastal Barrier Resources Overview, and System Mapper electronic database search for Sacramento, California. Last updated: March 13, 2019. Available at: www.fws.gov/cbra. Accessed December 4, 2020.
3. County of Sacramento, Office of Planning and Environmental Review, 2020. Initial Study, Mutual Housing and Habitat for Humanity at 46th Street, Control Number: PLNP: 2020-00054. Document released on November 9, 2020.
4. California Coastal Commission, 2019. California Coastal Zone Map. Available at: <https://databasin.org/datasets/ece6ae2d026b43959cfa11cceb2c07ac/>. Accessed December 4, 2019.
5. Geocon Consultants, Inc., 2013. Phase 1 Environmental Assessment, 46th Street and Lange Avenue, Sacramento, California, APN 039-0011-013-0000. Prepared for Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency. January 2013.
6. Analytical Environmental Services, 2020. Biological Resource Assessment, Mutual Housing California, 46th Street Property. Prepared for Mutual Housing California. August 2020.
7. Analytical Environmental Services, 2020. Cultural Resources Letter Report, 46th Street Low Income Housing Development Project, April 16, 2020.
8. Record of SHPO consultation.
9. Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc., 2019, Environmental Noise Assessment, 46th Street Affordable Housing, Sacramento County, California, BAC Job # 2019-230. Prepared for Mutual Housing California. December 3, 2019.
10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017. Sole Source Aquifer: Ground Water: Region 9. Available at: <https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/www3/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html>. Accessed January 12, 2021.
11. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2016. Electronic Database Search for National Wild and Scenic Rivers in California. Available at: <https://www.rivers.gov/rivers/american-lower.php>. Accessed January 12, 2021.
12. U.S. Census Bureau, 2019. American Community Survey 5-year estimates. Retrieved from Census Reporter Profile page for Census Tract 47.02, Sacramento, CA Available at: <http://censusreporter.org/profiles/14000US06067004702-census-tract-4702-sacramento-ca/>. Accessed January 12, 2021.

Attachments:

None.

List of Permits Obtained:

Building permits issued by Sacramento County are anticipated to be obtained by or before December 2022.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

Public outreach conducted to date has included several meetings with the South Sacramento Community Planning Advisory Council, and the project received that body's recommendation for approval on January 11, 2021. In addition, the County of Sacramento Office of Planning and Environmental Review circulated for public and agency review the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project's compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on November 9, 2020. Lastly, a notice of availability of the EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be published by SHRA.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, which would contribute to the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment include full buildout under the Sacramento County 2030 General Plan. This analysis focuses on the proposed project's potential to contribute significantly to cumulative impacts within that environment.

The analysis conducted for this Environmental Assessment has determined that the project would not result in adverse impacts for certain issues areas, including airport hazards, coastal barrier resources, flood insurance, operational air quality, coastal zone management, hazardous materials, explosive and flammable hazards, farmlands protection, floodplain management, sole source aquifers, wetlands protection, wild and scenic rivers, compatible land use and zoning, soil suitability, slope, erosion, drainage, stormwater runoff, educational and cultural facilities, commercial facilities, health care and social services, solid waste disposal, recycling, wastewater, water supply, public safety, police protection, fire protection, emergency medical services, parks, open space, recreation, transportation and accessibility, unique natural features, water resources, and greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently, the proposed project would not contribute to potentially adverse cumulative impacts for these issues.

The analysis determined that the proposed project could result in potential adverse impacts related to special status plant and wildlife species, migratory nesting birds, operational noise, and inadvertent discovery of subsurface archaeological resources and human remains, but implementation of required mitigation measures identified in this EA would ensure that these potential impacts would not be significant. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that the project's contribution to any cumulative impacts would not be significant.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]:

Alternative size configurations for the project were contemplated. However, the proposed project best meets the purpose and need for new affordable housing in its currently proposed manner. A larger development could have greater impacts on the human environment, although they could potentially be mitigated depending on the size of the development. A smaller development would not maximize the potential use of the property for affordable housing and would not necessarily avoid any impacts.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]:

The no action alternative would mean that the project site would likely not be developed with new high-quality affordable housing that would support the County's objective to bring new affordable housing units and satisfy a portion of the County's identified affordable housing needs.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

With adherence to applicable laws, authorities, and other enforceable measures, all potentially adverse effects of the proposed project would be reduced to levels below established significance thresholds or avoided completely. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result primarily in less-than-significant impacts to the environment with beneficial socioeconomic impacts.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors are detailed below. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Mitigation Measure A: 45 dB Interior Noise Reductions

Air conditioning units shall be provided for all units/residences within this development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired for additional acoustical isolation.

Additionally, per Plate IS-3 (Figure 2 of the noise study prepared for the proposed project), Buildings 2G, 2J, and 2H (shaded yellow in the graphic) shall be required to install exterior windows and doors with a minimum of STC-29 (1st floor), STC-33 (2nd story), and STC-38 (3rd story) ratings. The two single-family homes located at the southeast corner of the project site (shaded blue) shall be required to have exterior windows and doors with a minimum of STC-29 (1st floor) and STC-33 (2-story) ratings. The two single-family homes (shaded pink) shall be required to have exterior windows and doors with a minimum of STC-29 (1st story) and STC-32 (2nd story) ratings.

Mitigation Measure B: Compliance with the SSHCP

The applicant shall obtain authorization through the SSHCP prior to all ground-disturbing activities, on-site and off-site. Authorization under the SSHCP shall include implementation and conformance with all

applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures and payment of any fees necessary to mitigate for impacts to species and habitat.

SSHCP Authorization shall compensate for impacts associated with:

- Impacts to SSHCP land covers, including:
 - Valley grassland
 - Stream/creek
- Potential species-specific impacts including:
 - Burrowing owl
 - Cooper’s hawk
 - Ferruginous hawk
 - Loggerhead shrike
 - Sanford’s arrowhead
 - Swainson’s hawk
 - Special status raptors
 - White-tailed kite
 - Western red bat*

*AMMs specific to Western red bat shall also apply to Pallid bat

Mitigation Measure C: Migratory Bird Nest Protection

To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds the following shall apply:

1. If construction activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 50 feet of nesting habitat between February 1 and September 15, a survey for active migratory bird nests shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to construction by a qualified biologist.
2. Trees slated for removal shall be removed during the period of September through January, in order to avoid the nesting season. Any trees that are to be removed during the nesting season, which is February through September, shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist and will only be removed if no nesting migratory birds are found.

If active nest(s) are found in the survey area, a non-disturbance buffer, the size of which has been determined by a qualified biologist, shall be established and maintained around the nest to prevent nest failure. All construction activities shall be avoided within this buffer area until a qualified biologist determines that nestlings have fledged.

Mitigation Measure D: Unanticipated Discoveries

In the event that human remains are discovered in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work shall be halted and the County Coroner contacted. For all other unexpected cultural resources discovered during project construction, work shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist may evaluate the resource encountered.

1. Pursuant to Sections 5097.97 and 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, if a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work is to stop and the County Coroner and the Office of Planning and Environmental Review shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, and the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposition of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods.
2. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources (excluding human remains) during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained at the Applicant's expense to evaluate the significance of the find. If it is determined due to the types of deposits discovered that a Native American monitor is required, the Guidelines for Monitors/Consultants of Native American Cultural, Religious, and Burial Sites as established by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be followed, and the monitor shall be retained at the Applicant's expense.
 - a. Work cannot continue within the 100-foot radius of the discovery site until the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources.
 - b. If a potentially-eligible resource is encountered, then the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor, Planning and Environmental Review staff, and project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations or total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator as verification that the provisions of CEQA for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met.
3. The appended Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) Awareness Brochure provides a definition and examples of TCRs that may be encountered during construction. The brochure was developed to assist construction teams with the identification and protection of TCRs. The brochure shall be shared with construction teams prior to ground disturbance.

Mitigation Measure E: 20 Percent of Parking to be EV Ready

Per Best Management Practice (BMP) 2 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Tier 1 BMPs for greenhouse gas thresholds, the developer shall provide:

- a. a minimum of one EV Ready parking space per single-family unit; and
- b. 20 percent of the total number of parking spaces for the multi-family dwellings shall be constructed to an EV Ready level.

EV Ready requires the installation of “raceway” (the enclosed conduit that forms the physical pathway for electrical wiring to protect it from damage), adequate panel capacity for dedicated branch circuits, installation of dedicated branch circuit(s) (electrical pre-wiring), circuit breakers, and other electrical components, including a receptacle (240-volt outlet) or blank cover needed to support future installation of one or more charging stations.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
<p>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices.</p>	<p>The following Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices are considered feasible for controlling fugitive dust from a construction site. The practices also serve as best management practices (BMPs), allowing the use of the non-zero particulate matter significance thresholds.</p> <p>Control of fugitive dust is required by District Rule 403 and enforced by District staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads. • Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered. • Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph). • All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. <p>The following practices describe exhaust emission control from diesel powered fleets working at a construction site. California regulations limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel powered equipment. The California Air Resources Board enforces the idling limitations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site. • Although not required by local or state regulation, many construction companies have equipment inspection and maintenance programs to ensure work and fuel efficiencies. • Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer’s specifications. The

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<p>equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.</p> <p>Lead agencies may add these emission control practices as Conditions of Approval (COA) or include in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).</p>
Sacramento County Building Code	<p>Sacramento County requires all new plan review and permit applications to comply with the 2019 California Building Standards Codes which are based on the International Building and Fire Codes, the Uniform Plumbing and Mechanical Codes, and the National Electrical Code.</p> <p>All permit applications must comply with the provisions of the above codes as well as Energy Codes, Green Building Code and the applicable County Code amendments.</p>
24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	It is a HUD goal that the interior auditory environment shall not exceed a day-night average sound level of 45 decibels.
Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations	Residences must be designed to limit intruding noise to an interior CNEL (or DNL) of at least 45 decibels.
Sacramento County Code, Title 6 – Health and Sanitation, Chapter 6.68 – Noise Control	<p>Section 6.68.090 exempts certain activities from Chapter 6.68, including “noise sources associated with construction, repair, remodeling, demolition, paving or grading of any real property, provided said activities do not take place between the hours of eight p.m. and six a.m. on weekdays and Friday commencing at eight p.m. through and including seven a.m. on Saturday; Saturdays commencing at eight p.m. through and including seven a.m. on the next following Sunday and on each Sunday after the hour of eight p.m. Provided, however, when an unforeseen or unavoidable condition occurs during a construction project and the nature of the project necessitates that work in process be continued until a specific phase is completed, the contractor or owner shall be allowed to continue work after eight p.m. and to operate machinery and equipment necessary until completion of the specific work in progress can be brought to conclusion under conditions which will not jeopardize inspection acceptance or create undue financial hardships for the contractor or owner.</p>

Determination:

- Finding of No Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.
- Finding of Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature:  Date: March 22, 2021

Name/Title/Organization: Steve Smith/Technical Associate/ESA

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/Title: La Shelle Dozier, Executive Director, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).