Adopting Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project

**Issue:** Whether to adopt an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project and approve the release of bid documents for final design and vehicle procurement for the Project.

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project and approve the release of bid documents for final design and vehicle procurement for the Project.

**Discussion:** A project-level Environmental Assessment (EA) for NEPA and Initial Study (IS)/Mitigated Negative Declaration for CEQA has been prepared for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar project. (Attachment A.)

NEPA and CEQA require that local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. Although the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project is a joint effort of several public agencies, SACOG is the lead agency for the purpose of preparing the environmental review of this proposed project. The EA/IS and Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared by SACOG pursuant to NEPA and CEQA requirements.

The document was released for public review and comment on May 15, 2015. The public review period ended on June 22, 2015. Comments were received from four (4) public agencies and one (1) individual prior to the close of the review period. Another two comment letters were received after the close of the public review period. All comments, and responses thereto, are included in Attachment B.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to report on and monitor measures adopted as part of the environmental review process (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and the CEQA Guidelines sections 15091(d) and 15097). The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in Attachment C is intended to fulfill that requirement.

To complete the environmental review phase of this project, Staff recommends that the SACOG Transportation Committee adopt the Resolution included as Attachment D, adopting the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving the release of bid documents for final design and vehicle procurement for the Project.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:KT:ds  
Attachments

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
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INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST AND PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Project title:
   Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
   Sacramento Area Council of Governments
   1415 L Street
   Sacramento, California  95814

3. Contact person and phone number:
   Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel, (916) 340-6210

4. Project location:
   Sacramento, West Sacramento, California

5. Project sponsor's name and address:
   Sacramento Area Council of Governments
   1415 L Street
   Sacramento, California  95814

6. General plan designation:
   Sacramento: Traditional Center with Public use, and Parks and Recreation; Central Business District Central Business District with scattered Public use, and Parks and Recreation; Urban Corridor High
   West Sacramento: Central Business District; Riverfront Mixed Use

7. Zoning:
   Sacramento:  C-3 (Central Business District); C-2 (General Commercial); R-5 (Multi-Family); and R-4 (Multi-Family); RMX (Residential Mixed Use)
   West Sacramento: Central Business District; Waterfront – Planned Development No. 41

8. Description of project:
   Refer to Section 3 of the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS).
9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Commercial, Residential, Governmental, Recreation, Transportation

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Federal Transit Administration (FTA); Cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento; Sacramento Regional Transit (RT); the Yolo County Transportation District; the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; Federal Railroad Administration; California Public Utilities Commission; U.S. Coast Guard
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INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the Project. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and brief discussion of each environmental factor. Reference to the more extensive analysis and mitigation measures presented in the preceding EA/IS sections is provided for those environmental factors potentially affected by the Project.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects 1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required.

_________________________________________________________  ____________
Signature                                                     Date

_________________________________________________________  ____________
Signature                                                     Date
AESTHETICS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The existing aesthetics conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.1, Aesthetics/Visual Quality.

a-d) Scenic Vista, Scenic Resources, Visual Character, Light or Glare

See the discussion in Section 4.1, Aesthetics/Visual Quality. Construction of the Project would not obstruct, alter, or degrade existing views along the proposed alignment or degrade the existing visual character of the study area. No designated State scenic highways are present in the study area. Although the Project would include additional lighting at station platforms and at the Sacramento Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF), this lighting would comply with applicable standards for wattage, shielding, and security and would not create a new source of glare. Therefore, all potential visual impacts resulting from the Project would be less than significant.
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g])?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Environmental Setting

The Project would be located in an urbanized area; it does not contain any agricultural or forest land.

a-e) Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The Project would be in an urbanized area; it does not contain any agricultural or forest land and is not adjacent to any. Therefore, no impacts on agricultural or forest lands would occur.
AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Environmental Setting

The existing air quality conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

a-e) Air Quality

An analysis of potential impact to air quality associated with construction and operation of the Project is included in the EA/IS in Section 4.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The results of this analysis determined that the Project would comply with the applicable air quality plan and emissions of all criteria air pollutants would be below regulatory thresholds. There would not be a cumulatively considerable net increase of ozone or ozone precursors, or particulate matter. Potential impacts related to the Project would be less than significant.

In general, odors are usually associated with sources such as wastewater treatment plants, composting facilities, and chemical plants. Such inherently odorous sources are not part of the Project. Furthermore, the Project is an electric streetcar with no operational emissions and no direct odorous emissions. Therefore, impacts related to the generation of odors would be less than significant.
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or United States Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or United States Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Setting

The vegetation community in the study area is mostly urban landscaped or ornamental vegetation, with a mixture of native and nonnative ornamental trees and shrubs along sidewalks and medians. Undeveloped areas are generally poorly vegetated, with some weedy, ruderal vegetation. Along the Sacramento River near the Tower Bridge, a narrow band of large-stature riparian woodland occurs, dominated by Fremont cottonwood and valley oak. The study area supports a relatively low diversity of wildlife because it is in an urbanized area subjected to frequent human activity. Most
wildlife species observed or expected in the study area are adapted to urban environments, and several are nonnative species.

**a) Effects to Special-Status Species**

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, several special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur in or along the edge of the proposed alignment. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.3.4 would reduce potentially-significant impacts to special-status wildlife species to a less-than-significant level.

**B, c) Effects to Riparian or other Sensitive Natural Communities; Wetlands and other Waters**

No construction would take place directly in riparian habitats, as the Project alignment across the Sacramento River would occur above the riparian area on the Tower Bridge. All Project activities would take place in developed and paved urban areas that also do not support wetland habitat. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat and waters of the U.S. would be less than significant.

**d) Interference with Wildlife or Fisheries Migratory Corridors**

As discussed in the EA/IS in Section 4.3.4, Biological Resources, construction of the Project may affect nesting birds, and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts related to interference with wildlife or fisheries migratory corridors to less-than-significant levels.

**e) Conflicts with Local Policies**

The City of West Sacramento and the City of Sacramento both have tree preservation regulations, which are further described in the EA/IS in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources. Numerous large ornamental trees are planted in and along the edge of the proposed alignment. Some trees and other mature vegetation may need to be trimmed or removed during construction activities. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3.4 would minimize environmental impacts associated with the removal of trees and other mature vegetation during Project construction and operation to a less-than-significant level.

**f) Conflicts with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan**

There are no proposed or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan that encompasses the project area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any such plan, and there would be no impact.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

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

Environmental Setting

The existing cultural resource conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.4, Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources. Information in this section is based on the Archaeological Resources Assessment for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project (URS, 2015b) and the Built Environment Resource Report Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project (JRP, 2015).

a-d) Historical and Archaeological Resources

As described in Section 4.4, Historic Architectural, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources, the Project has been designed to avoid adverse effects to historic properties and buried cultural resources. Operation of the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on historic, archaeological or paleontological resources. The Project would result in no significant effects to historic architectural resources. However, ground disturbance activities could inadvertently result in impacts to buried elements of the RSHS Historic District, and historic and prehistoric archaeological resources listed and eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and SRHCR. Construction activities could also disturb paleontological resources. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4.4 would avoid and minimize the potential impacts related to inadvertent discovery during construction and potential impacts would, therefore, be reduced to less-than-significant.
### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |
|    | □ |

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

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

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

**Environmental Setting**

The existing geologic conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity.

**a-i, ii, iii) Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismic-Related Ground Failure**

The proposed alignment is in a seismically quiescent area, and no active faults are known to exist in its vicinity. Accordingly, the potential for ground displacement due to surface faulting is considered...
negligible. All Project facilities would be designed and constructed in compliance with applicable seismic standards. Therefore, the Project would not result in an increased exposure to potential adverse effects associated with seismicity, and no impact would occur.

a-iv) Landslides

The Project would be constructed in an area that is essentially flat terrain, where landslides and debris flows do not occur. Therefore, the Project would have no impacts related to landslides.

b) Substantial Erosion

Project construction could result in the loss of topsoil and make soils more susceptible to erosion. Minimal portions of the project site would be cleared and graded in preparation for construction of the West Sacramento MSF option and the nonrevenue track to the MSF site. As part of the clearing and grading, an unknown but likely small amount of topsoil would need to be removed. This soil would likely be reused or disposed of on site. As described in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, compliance with applicable regulations and proper implementation of general construction best management practices would ensure that impacts associated with loss of soil would be less than significant.

c) Unstable Geologic Unit

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, final design of the Project would comply with all regulations (including Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code) adopted to ensure the Project would not present a risk to life or property associated with unstable geologic conditions or soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Expansive Soils

Expansive soils do not occur in the project area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Septic Tanks and Wastewater

Installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not included in the Project; soil capable of adequately supporting such improvements is not required. No impact would occur.
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Environmental Setting

The environmental and regulatory setting for Greenhouse Gas emissions is included in the EA/IS in Section 4.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

a, b) Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Construction of the Project would result in minor temporary increases in GHG emissions, as described in the EA/IS Section 4.2. These increases would be associated with the operation of construction equipment, material-hauling vehicles, and construction employee vehicles.

Operation of the streetcar vehicles would require electricity consumption, which would indirectly generate GHGs. Operation of the MSF would also result in emissions of GHGs from energy use, vehicle use by employees, generation and disposition of waste, and use of water. However, increased streetcar ridership would result in direct reductions in the use of light trucks and automobiles that otherwise would be used. The air quality management districts in the project area do not have quantitative thresholds for GHGs, but the level of emissions expected to be generated by the Project is well below published thresholds in other air districts. Therefore, impacts related to GHGs would be less than significant.
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The existing hazards and hazardous materials conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
a, b) Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials, and Accidental Spills

All hazardous materials would be handled, managed, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. The streetcars proposed for use would be electrically powered. Due to the lack of fossil fuel, there is little chance for release of hazardous materials or wastes into the environment due to an upset or accident condition associated with the streetcars themselves, and no impacts would occur.

c, e, g) Within One-Quarter Mile of Schools, Public Airport, Interference with Emergency Plans

The Project would not place project features within ¼ mile of a public school or in close proximity to an airport. Project design would comply with the Sacramento County Area Plan for Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents, the West Sacramento Standard Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan, and the California Fire Code. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Hazardous Materials Sites Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5

The Project could be on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A large number of database records indicate sites in close proximity to the project area that have confirmed soil and/or groundwater contamination. Unreported hazardous materials may also be encountered in the project area that could generate conditions that would be a hazard to public health and the environment. Implementation of mitigation, as identified in Section 4.7.5, would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

f) Private Airstrip

The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impacts would result.

h) Wildfires

CAL FIRE has designated the project area as an “LRA Unzoned” zone in the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento (Figure 4.7-3). The project area is relatively well developed, and there is little to no potential for wildland fires in the project area. Therefore, no impact would occur.
## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

The existing hydrology and water quality conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality.

a – f) Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements, Groundwater Supply and Recharge, Erosion or Siltation On/Off Site, Flooding from Surface Runoff, Polluted Surface Runoff, Other Sources Affecting Water Quality

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, construction and operation of the Project would comply with all regulatory and permit requirements regarding impacts to water quality. Therefore, by complying with the NPDES Permits, complying with the appropriate city and Caltrans Statewide Permit requirements, and implementing standard BMPs described in Section 4.8.3.2, the Project would avoid adverse impacts on water quality during construction or operations, and no mitigation measures would be required. Potential impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

g, h) Housing and Structures within 100-Year Flood Hazard Area

The project area in Downtown Sacramento is designated as either Flood Zone X (areas protected by levees from the 100-year flood), or Other Areas Zone X (areas determined to be outside of the 500-year flood). The designation for the project area in the City of West Sacramento is Flood Zone X, (areas protected by levees from the 100-year floods). No housing or structures would be placed in a FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain and no impact would occur.

i) Risk from Levee or Dam Failure

Although unlikely, a failure of an upstream dam such as Folsom Dam or Nimbus Dam could inundate both Downtown Sacramento and West Sacramento. Although the occurrence of dam failure inundation is based on extremely remote probabilities, the counties and cities have plans in place for the evacuation of people from areas subject to inundation from a dam failure. These evacuation plans ensure that the risk related to levee or dam failure would be less than significant.

j) Seiches, Tsunami, or Mudflow

The Project is not near a body of water subject to seiches or tsunamis. The project location has a very low potential for inundation by mudflow. The banks of levees have the potential to landslide; however, the Project would not alter the levees. Therefore, no impact would occur.
LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Environmental Setting

The existing land use conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning.

a, b) Established Communities and Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning, the streetcar platforms and tracks would be constructed in existing public right-of-way; no additional right-of-way would be acquired for the Project. The Project would not create new barriers or divide existing neighborhoods in the study area; rather, it would result in a beneficial effect by creating greater connectivity along the proposed alignment.

The Project would be consistent with the City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento General Plan Land Use goals of improving transit in and between the planned growth areas in Downtown Sacramento and West Sacramento. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Conservation Plans

No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans have been adopted for the project area in the vicinity of the Project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Environmental Setting

The potential for the presence of mineral resources in the study area was determined using California Geologic Survey report information. The study area is in Mineral Resource Zone 1, an area where the information indicates that no significant mineral deposits exist, or little likelihood exists for their presence.

a, b) Available Known Mineral Resource, Locally Important Mineral Resource Recovery Site

There are no known important mineral deposits or mining activities for oil, coal, natural gas, sand, gravel, or crushed stone in the project area. No mineral resource recovery sites exist; therefore, no impact would occur.
NOISE

Would the project:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Environmental Setting

The existing noise conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration.

a,c,d) Noise Levels

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, ambient noise levels are expected to exceed criteria at several different sensitive receptors; however, the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures identified in Section 4.10.5 would reduce the impacts less-than-significant levels.

b) Vibration

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, operation of the streetcar at maximum speeds (30-35 mph) may cause vibration levels to be above FTA criteria at some receptors, potentially causing a significant impact. However, it is anticipated that during the
detailed engineering phase of the Project, site-specific testing at the locations of impacted receptors indicated by the current analysis will result in the elimination of most and possibly all of the impacts from vibration. Where vibration impacts remain, they would be minimized to a less-than-significant level with the implementation measures identified in Section 4.10.5.

e, f) Proximity to Airports

The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within 2 miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Would the project:**

a) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The existing population and housing conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.12, Socioeconomics and Regional Growth.

**a) Population Growth**

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.12, Socioeconomics and Regional Growth, rather than induce growth, the Project would accommodate growth that has been projected in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ (SACOGs’) regional transportation plan and planned by both the cities in the study area. The operation of a new streetcar line in the study area could accommodate population growth near the proposed transit stations by enhancing the attractiveness of the corridor for residents and workers. The Project would provide increased accessibility to transit and improved mobility by providing an alternative for trips between West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento. However, these changes would largely represent a redistribution of projected growth rather than an increase, and therefore a potential increase in population would be considered less than significant.

**b, c) Displace Housing or People**

The Project would be constructed in existing public right-of-way; no additional right-of-way would be acquired. The Project would not displace existing housing or require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no displacement impacts on housing or people would occur.
PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Environmental Setting

As described in the introduction to Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures of the EA/IS, the Project would not induce a substantial increase in population in the study area beyond that projected in regional plans. Therefore, the Project would not require an increase in public services such as schools or fire/police protection.

a) Impacts to Public Services

The Project does not include new land uses or intensification of existing land uses that would lead to substantial population growth. Therefore, the Project would not generate new population that would require additional public services. Alteration of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities would not be required and no impact would occur.
RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Environmental Setting

The existing recreational conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.11, Parks and Recreation.

a) Physical Deterioration of Recreational Resources

The Project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population in the study area. Access to existing parks and recreational facilities along the proposed alignment may be improved—particularly in those areas closest to streetcar stations—due to the increase in transit options. However, this would not result in a substantial increase in the number of park users.

The Project is not expected to produce adverse short- or long-term effects on the physical condition of existing recreational facilities and parklands along the proposed alignment. Operation of the streetcar may increase periodic noise for users of Saint Rose of Lima Park and Capitol Park due to the proximity of these parks to the proposed alignment. These two parks are located in an urban setting, where noise from existing traffic and LRT operations is typical. In addition, noise increases associated with the Project in the vicinity of the two parks would be well below the threshold of the allowable increase in cumulative noise levels as defined by the FTA and described in detail in Section 5.4.1. Therefore, impacts on recreational resources would be less than significant.

b) Construction or Expansion of Recreational Resources

The Project does not include new recreational facilities. In addition, the Project does not include features that would result in the need for new or expanded recreational facilities or parklands. Therefore, no impact would occur.
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Environmental Setting

The existing transportation conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.13, Transportation.

a, b) Conflict with Applicable Plans, Ordinances, Policies, and Programs

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.13, Transportation, the operation of the Project would have a less-than-significant impact on congestion levels, levels of service, and other policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

Construction activities would require the temporary closure of one or more travel lanes on multi-lane streets where there are typically two travel lanes available in each direction. This could result
in potentially-significant impacts; however, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.13.5 would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant.

c) Air Traffic Patterns

As described in the EA in Section 4.13, Transportation, no change in air traffic patterns would occur due to the construction or operation of the Project. Therefore, no impact is expected.

d) Hazards

The Project will be designed to comply with all applicable safety standards and regulations; therefore, the Project would not substantially increase hazards and no impact is expected.

e) Emergency Access

As described in the EA/IS in Section 4.13, Transportation, the proposed streetcar tracks would be installed on multi-lane streets where there are typically two travel lanes available in each direction. Construction activities would require the temporary closure of one or more travel lanes, particularly if equipment and building materials were temporarily stored in the street as sections of old roadway were removed. Lane closures may require temporary rerouting of transit services and bicycle facilities and the temporary removal of on-street parking spaces.

Construction of streetcar track, structural underpinning, and the catenary system on the Tower Bridge could also temporarily restrict use of the lift mechanism to raise and lower the bridge. However, restrictions on use of the lift mechanism would be closely coordinated with USCG the Coast Guard to minimize impacts. Construction would occur during times of the year when chances of an impact are minimal to avoid adverse effects to navigation.

Temporary lane and bridge closures could result in short-term impacts to emergency access; however, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.13.5 would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

f) Public Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians

The Project would improve access to transit for the area served, extend the range of pedestrians by allowing for pedestrian travel augmented by streetcar, and provide a travel option for cyclists who commute or travel to the region’s urban core for other purposes. Therefore, the operation of the Project would have no impact. However, construction activities would require the temporary closure of one or more travel lanes on multi-lane streets where there are typically two travel lanes available in each direction. Lane closures may require temporary rerouting of bicycle facilities. This construction impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 4.13.5.
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less Than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

Environmental Setting

The existing utilities and service systems conditions in the project area are described in the EA/IS in Section 4.6, Energy and Utilities.

a) Wastewater Treatment

Additional wastewater generated by the propose project would be limited to project activities at the MSF. This would not lead to an exceedance of the wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, no impact is expected.

b, c) Construction of New Water, Wastewater Treatment, and Stormwater Drainage Facilities

The operation of the streetcar would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, or expansion of existing...
facilities because the Project would be constructed in existing right-of-way in paved roads already served by existing infrastructure. As part of the Project, an MSF would be constructed to store and maintain the streetcar vehicles when not in use. The MSF would need water and wastewater treatment, but the increase in demand and use of these utilities would be minimal. Therefore, no impact is expected.

d) Water Supplies

The Project would be served by existing infrastructure. As part of the Project, an MSF would be constructed to store and maintain the streetcar vehicles when not in use. The MSF site would require water supplies to serve the project for cleaning purposes from existing entitlements and resources, but use would be incremental and would not require any new or expanded entitlements. Therefore, no impact on water supply would occur as a result of the Project.

e) Wastewater Treatment

The Project would not result in increased wastewater discharges or introduce additional sources of pollutants to the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, there would be no impact on the capacity of the wastewater treatment system to serve the Project.

f, g) Landfill Capacity and Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations

Construction and operation of the Project, including the MSF, would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to construction and solid waste. Therefore, solid waste generated from the Project’s construction and operation would not substantially affect the projected life of the landfill, and impacts from solid waste generation or impacts on solid waste facilities would be less than significant.
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

a) Degrade the Quality of the Environment

As discussed in this Initial Study Checklist and the more detailed EA/IS analysis, the Project has the potential for impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and vibration, and transportation. Mitigation measures identified in the EA/IS would reduce these potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore the Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in this Initial Study Checklist and the more detailed EA/IS analysis, compliance with existing regulatory regulations and required permits would ensure that the Project would have less-than-significant impacts on aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, and utilities and service systems. In addition, while the Project could result in significant impact to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and vibration, and transportation, these impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. These less-than-significant impacts could combine with impacts from other projects in proximity to the Project. However, most of the less-than-significant impacts associated with the Project are site-specific and project-specific and there is little, if any, cumulative relationship between implementation of the Project.
and other projects throughout the study area. In addition, because of the Project’s location in existing roadway rights-of-way, the effects of the Project are not anticipated to contribute to cumulative effects with other development projects in the area. Therefore, the incremental impacts related to the Project would not combine with the incremental impacts of other projects proposed for the study area and potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

c) Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings

As discussed in this Initial Study Checklist and the more detailed EA/IS analysis, the Project has the potential for impacts to resources that could cause adverse effects on humans. However, compliance with existing regulatory regulations and required permits, as well as the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EA/IS, would ensure that these impacts would remain less than significant.
PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) have prepared a joint Environmental Assessment (EA)/Initial Study (IS) to address the environmental effects of the proposed Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970. FTA is serving as the lead agency for NEPA, and SACOG is the lead agency for CEQA. Other public agencies that have discretionary approval over the Project—and are, therefore, responsible agencies under CEQA—are the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento, Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT), Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

SACOG, the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, YCTD, and RT, have undertaken advanced planning, environmental, and engineering activities for the reintroduction of the streetcar to connect the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento and their shared riverfront. It is anticipated that the development plans and growth projections for West Sacramento’s redevelopment areas and Downtown Sacramento will generate greater travel demand for local mobility and roadway capacity than is currently available. The purpose of the Project is to improve transit service and local circulation by connecting West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento with an alternative (non-auto) mode, and supporting existing and future development in the City of West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento.

The 3.3-mile streetcar alignment would extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown entertainment and retail district in Sacramento. Mixed-use neighborhoods in the Washington Neighborhood and the Railyards Specific Plan area have been planned around a future high-quality transit system intended to serve these new and emerging employment and residential districts. Several key destinations in these neighborhoods would be connected by the Project, including: Raley Field; Old Sacramento; the Sacramento Valley Station in the Railyards Specific Plan area; Downtown Plaza Mall; the historic Memorial Auditorium; the Sacramento Community Center Theater; the California State Capitol building; the Sacramento Entertainment and Sports Center (ESC); and the Sacramento Convention Center. The alignment also includes service to the Bridge District in West Sacramento along Riverfront Street and the relocation of existing light rail service from K Street to H Street between 7th and 12th streets in Downtown Sacramento, both to be constructed in later phases of the project.

The alignment for the proposed streetcar is primarily along existing city streets. New track would be laid for the entire alignment within West Sacramento and across Tower Bridge. East of Tower Bridge, new track would be installed in the road bed on Capitol Mall to 3rd Street and north on 3rd Street to the Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility where it would connect with existing LRT tracks that run east onto H Street. Short sections of new track would also be necessary on 7th Street from just north of J Street to K Street, and on 12th Street between K and L streets. The full
lengths of J, L, and 19th streets would require new track. New track would also be placed on H Street between 8th and 12th streets to accommodate the relocation of LRT from K Street.

The proposed project includes the installation of 12 westbound and 13 eastbound stations. New station platforms would be concrete slabs constructed within the sidewalk and/or roadbed and would not require removal of any existing granite curbs or street trees. Station elements may include such amenities as a canopy mounted on structural supports, supplemental lighting, fare machines, schedule and patron information rack, bench, lean rail, trash receptacle, sign with stop name, and an ADA pedestrian warning strip running the length of the boarding area.

The traction power facilities (support poles, catenary poles, and substations) would also be located within the public right-of-way. Substations would convert electrical current to the proper voltage for streetcars and be approximately 375 square feet in size. Support and catenary poles of the Overhead Contact System (OCS) will be spaced along the streetcar alignment and will be similar to the system that is currently in place today for the light rail system in Downtown Sacramento. The maximum span between OCS poles is typically 120 feet; existing utility and LRT poles, and suitable buildings (i.e., not historic properties) will be used whenever possible to attach wires.

There are two potential sites considered for a maintenance and storage facility (MSF), one in Sacramento and the other in West Sacramento. The MSF will accommodate daily and routine vehicle inspections, interior/exterior cleaning of the streetcars, preventive (scheduled) maintenance, unscheduled maintenance, and component change-out. The potential MSF in Sacramento would be constructed beneath the Business 80/50 elevated freeway viaduct in the area bounded by X Street, W Street, 19th Street, and RT’s South Line LRT tracks, on land currently owned by Caltrans and leased to the City of Sacramento for parking. The potential MSF in West Sacramento would be constructed beneath the Business 80/50 freeway (Pioneer Bridge) near South River Road and Mill Street/Riverfront Street in Caltrans right-of-way.

**DETERMINATION**

This proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that SACOG intends to adopt an MND for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project). This does not mean that SACOG’s decision regarding the Project is final. This MND is subject to modification based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

SACOG has prepared an Initial Study (IS) for this Project; and pending public review, expects to determine from this IS that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

- The Project would result in no effects on agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, population and housing, seismicity, risk of wildland fire, or generate the need for new public services.

- Compliance with existing plans, regulations and required permits would ensure that the Project would have less-than-significant impacts on aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils,
greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, recreation, and utilities and service systems.

- Although the Project could result in significant impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, energy and utility disruption, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and vibration, and transportation, these impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the incorporation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measure Bio-1: Nesting Birds**

To avoid direct impacts to nesting birds during construction, including raptors such as Swainson's hawk and migratory birds, the following impact avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented.

Conduct site preparation, such as vegetation removal, and initiate construction, during the non-nesting season (generally September 1 through February 15). If work is initiated during the nesting season (generally February 15 through August 31), then a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey within 2 weeks prior to construction to determine if active nests occur in the project area or could be affected in the vicinity. If at any time during construction there is a delay of activities of at least 2 weeks during nesting season, then surveys shall be conducted again. The surveys must cover the construction area footprint, and out a distance of at least 250 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors. Surveys for Swainson’s hawk shall follow the methods described in the Swainson’s hawk Technical Advisory Committee Guidelines. If no active nests are identified, then no impacts would be expected, and no further measures are required.

If active bird nests are identified, one or more of the following additional measures are required:

- Construction in the vicinity of the nest must be delayed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active, or has been abandoned, or young have fledged.
- If construction cannot be delayed, then a qualified biologist with stop work authority shall establish a non-disturbance buffer with either modified or no ground-disturbing work, and monitor the nest site to determine if nesting behavior is being disrupted. CDFW and USFWS shall be consulted to reach concurrence on the suitability of the non-disturbance buffer, considering line of site, distance, species, and type of activities proposed near the nest. If nesting behavior is disrupted, then work activities shall be redirected to other areas and/or modified in such a way that no further disruption is observed. Monitoring, if needed, shall occur at least twice per week during construction until the nest is no longer active.

**Mitigation Measure Bio-2: Bird Nests on Structures**
Swallow nests and nests of other species, such as martins, that could be affected by construction shall be removed prior to new ground disturbance during the non-nesting season. Swallows are persistent, and continued monitoring and maintenance is required to ensure that nests that are initiated are removed. Nest removal is commonly accomplished mechanically with a jet of high pressure water, such as with a fire hose. As the birds attempt to build new nests, they shall be removed as needed, typically weekly or even daily, before they are completed. Alternatively, exclusion devices could be installed on structures to prevent new nests from being established during construction. Pre-emptive nest removal, prevention of new nesting, and ongoing monitoring and maintenance during nesting season, would avoid disruption of active nests on structures during construction.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Roosting Bats**

The most suitable habitat for pallid bat in the study area is around and inside man-made structures. Preconstruction bat surveys would be conducted to inspect the undersides of the Tower Bridge and the Business Interstate 80 (I 80) overpass for roosting bats. A qualified biologist shall inspect structures and trees prior to removal or construction to determine if bats are roosting. If no roosting bats are found, no further mitigation would be necessary. If bats are present, the biologist shall direct the installation of one-way exclusion devices to allow bats to vacate the structure or tree prior to construction. Exclusionary devices, such as plastic sheeting, or plastic or wire mesh, can be used to allow bats to exit but not reenter any occupied roosts. Expanding foam and plywood sheets can be used to prevent bats from re-entering unoccupied roosts during construction. Exclusion devices shall be inspected, monitored, and maintained on structures during construction. Excluding bats from project trees and structures would avoid construction related impacts to this species.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Replace Any Removed Tree per City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento Requirements.**

At this time, there are no tree removals anticipated within the City of Sacramento. In West Sacramento, 15 recently planted London plane trees in the median of West Capitol Ave in front of West Sacramento City Hall will likely be removed. There is also one landmark-sized liquid amber tree in front of City Hall that also may be affected. Should trees need to be removed for construction, the Project sponsor will follow the applicable conditions of the City of Sacramento or City of West Sacramento requirements for replacing removed trees. The ordinances require a permit for tree removal or impacts to street trees, and either, replanting and maintaining replacement trees at an appropriate ratio specified by the cities under the ordinance; or, the payment of an in-lieu fee to the cities. The in-lieu fees fund the planting and maintaining of street trees in the cities, and therefore compensate each jurisdiction for in-kind replacement.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1: Pre-Construction Resource Identification.**

Additional identification efforts will consist of further archival research and subsurface exploration to avoid impacts to historic properties. As the Project design is advanced,
additional archival research will be conducted to help identify specific locations in the APE where contributing elements of the RSHS District may exist. This research will target those areas of the design that coincide with known or likely below-grade hollow sidewalks or raised street structures. Preconstruction subsurface explorations will be conducted where construction is anticipated to approach the vertical limits of the APE in areas sensitive for cultural resources (both pre-historic and historic). The Project proponent will also coordinate with the City of Sacramento and property owners to obtain permission to access any remaining hollow sidewalk segments that are identified or suspected to exist in areas that could be affected by construction, particularly installation of OCS poles. If access is obtained and hollow sidewalks are present, the potentially affected hollow sidewalk segment(s) will be field recorded and the data collected will be added to the existing RSHS District Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 recordation forms (Downey, 2010), following the protocol described in the Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP) for the Project described below. This recordation will capture data about the hollow sidewalks/raised streets that are not readily available, and will improve access to information about these historic resources. If access cannot be obtained, the Project proponent will use ground-penetrating radar or other means to confirm the presence or absence of hollow sidewalk segments in the construction footprint. Should hollow sidewalks be identified in areas of potential OCS pole location, avoidance options will be executed. These options include modifying the proposed OCS pole locations, modifying track and system elements that are causing a conflict, modifying the pole foundation type, using a building attachment, or attaching span or pull-off wires to a backbone wire between two other poles or structures. The attachment of wires to adjacent buildings may require modification of the APE to accommodate those buildings, which would also necessitate re-consultation with the SHPO. No structures that are historic properties would be selected for wire attachment.

Furthermore, if research or field investigation confirms the presence of historic or prehistoric archaeological resources that are eligible for the NRHP, and that would be in conflict with Project construction, the Project proponent will revisit the design to avoid adverse effects to historic properties.

**Mitigation Measure CR-2: Monitoring.**

All ground-disturbing activities in Downtown Sacramento will be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and, when appropriate (i.e., within 500 feet of known prehistoric sites), a Native American representative of any tribe that has been determined a consulting party to the Project. If any prehistoric or historic-era features, or human remains, are exposed during construction, work will stop or be redirected to allow for recordation, including photography, measurements, and Global Positioning System/Geological Information System (GPS/GIS) data. Field recordation data will be added to the existing P-34-2358/RSHS District DPR 523 recordation form (Downey, 2010; Tremaine, 2008).

**Mitigation Measure CR-3: Discovery.**
Inadvertent discovery of cultural resources. If cultural resources are encountered at a location beyond the Downtown Sacramento area, or in locations not identified by research or other investigations during the pre-construction period, work will stop or be redirected within 50 feet of the finds to allow for recordation, including photography, measurements, and GPS/GIS data in accordance with the UDP.

Inadvertent discovery of hollow sidewalk. If hollow sidewalk features or raised street structures are encountered in locations not identified by research or other investigations during the pre-construction period, work will stop in order to allow recordation. The field recordation data collected (e.g., photography, field measurements, and GPS/GIS data) will be added to the existing RSHS District DPR 523 (Downey, 2010) recordation form. This recordation will follow the protocol for treating cultural resources identified as inadvertent discoveries described in the UDP for the Project. The UDP will describe treatment for both prehistoric and below-grade historic-era resources, including all elements that contribute to the RSHS District.

Inadvertent discovery of human remains. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human burial. If human remains are encountered, work should halt within 100 feet of the remains and, as required by law, the Sacramento or Yolo County Coroner should be notified immediately. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the NAHC within 24 hours of that determination. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code 5097.98, the NAHC, in turn, will immediately contact an individual who is most likely descended from the remains (aka: a Most Likely Descendent [MLD]). The MLD has 48 hours to inspect the site and recommend treatment of the remains. The landowner is obligated to work with the MLD in good faith to find a respectful resolution to the situation and entertain all reasonable options regarding the descendants’ preferences for treatment.

Mitigation Measure CR-4: Prepare an UDP.

An UDP will be developed prior to the initiation of construction. The UDP will provide detailed descriptions of protection and mitigation measures for archaeological resources in the APE. The UDP will include guidelines for avoidance of historic properties and establishment of environmentally sensitive areas; data recovery guidelines for those known historic properties/historical resources that cannot be avoided by Project design; protocols for treating cultural resources identified during preconstruction subsurface explorations, monitoring activities, and as inadvertent discoveries, including human remains; monitoring during construction; responsibilities and coordination with Native American tribes and individuals; and curation of recovered materials. The UDP will address treatment for both prehistoric resources, including human remains, and historic-era resources, including all elements that contribute to P-34-2358/RSHS District. All activities outlined in the UDP will be conducted under the direction of individuals who meet the professional qualification standards in Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guideline (Federal Register, Volume 48, No. 190, September 29, 1983).
As Project design progresses, all effort will be made to avoid known historic properties in the APE. Resources avoided by Project design will be identified as environmentally sensitive areas to ensure that these locations are not inadvertently encroached upon during construction. Newly identified cultural resources identified during preconstruction subsurface explorations, monitoring activities, and as inadvertent discoveries during construction will require testing to assess their research potential and eligibility for the listing in the NRHP and the CRHR. Archaeological testing will proceed with guidance from the National Park Service Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties (National Park Service, 2000). Evaluation efforts will involve archival research and archaeological fieldwork. Fieldwork methodologies will be tailored to the location, circumstance, and nature of the find. It therefore may be appropriate to use mechanical trenching techniques, controlled excavation units, or block exposures, shovel sampling explorations, or any combination of the above. All newly identified resources will be thoroughly mapped, photographed, located through Global Positioning System (GPS), and recorded on DPR 523 forms. If resources are found to be eligible to the NRHP or the CRHR, and they cannot be avoided by construction, data recovery will be required. Data recovery will conform to the principles in Parts I and II of Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1980), the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation” (Federal Register, Vol. 48, September 29, 1983, pp. 44716–44742), and appropriate SHPO guidelines. Data recovery may involve archaeological excavation, or for resources such as hollow sidewalks, detailed recordation on DPR 523 forms.

All construction will immediately cease within 100 feet in all directions of the discovery of human remains, which will then be treated in accordance with the requirements of Section 7050.5 of the California State Health and Human Safety Code. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the California NAHC, and the provisions of Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code will be followed.

All subsurface construction related to the Project will be monitored by a professional archaeologist, and as appropriate, by a Native American representative. Monitors will be responsible for working with construction personnel and identifying cultural resources that may be uncovered during ground disturbance. If cultural materials are unearthed, the monitor will have the authority to immediately halt work to allow the onsite archaeological monitor to inspect and assess the materials, determine whether additional analysis of the find is warranted, or whether construction can proceed without further analysis. Should additional analysis be required, testing protocols will be developed.

The FTA and the Project proponent will continually consult with Native American tribes about the treatment of resources of ancestral significance throughout Project development and construction. The UDP will define the responsibilities of the Native American tribes or individuals who are consulting parties to the Project. Native American monitors will have the opportunity to be present during testing and data recovery excavations on prehistoric and multicomponent sites, and during all construction activities in areas determined
sensitive for the presence of subsurface prehistoric or ethnographic resources. It is recommended that Native American monitors meet the minimum qualifications in the guidelines provided by the NAHC (2012). Participating tribes will ultimately be responsible for identifying the individuals who will represent their tribe as monitors. The Native American monitors are expected to report to their tribal government or designee to keep them informed of Project activities. The Native American monitors and archaeological monitors will work together as a team to observe ground-disturbing activities.

All cultural materials and associated records resulting from identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties conducted under the UDP shall be properly maintained in accordance with 36 CFR Part 79, and the provisions under 43 CFR Part 10 if the archaeological materials are determined to be of Native American origin, and the State of California’s Guidelines for the Curation of Archeological Collections (State Historical Resources Commission, Department of Parks and Recreation, 1993). The Project proponent will consult with Native American tribes and individuals affiliated with the cultural materials on repatriation, as appropriate. If the Project proponent and consulting tribes cannot agree, the FTA will ensure that all cultural materials discovered on State lands are curated.

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Train construction personnel on paleontological resources, and cease work in event of paleontological discovery.

The Project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to carry out all actions related to paleontological resources. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, the qualified paleontologist shall train all construction personnel working on the Project. The training shall include an overview of potential paleontological resources that could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities to facilitate worker recognition, avoidance, and subsequent immediate notification to the qualified paleontologist for further evaluation and action, as appropriate. The training should also include an overview of penalties for unauthorized artifact collecting or intentional disturbance of paleontological resources.

If any items of paleontological interest are discovered, the contractor shall be required to immediately suspend all work activities within 100 feet of the discovery site and immediately contact the lead agency. Work shall not be resumed until authorization is received from the lead agency and any recommendations received from a qualified paleontologist are implemented. Any accidental discovery of paleontological resources during construction shall be evaluated by the qualified paleontologist. If it is determined that the Project could damage a unique paleontological resource, as defined per the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2, and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall develop a treatment plan in consultation with the lead agency.

The treatment plan shall be a site-specific plan in report format that shall:

1. Detail strategies for the management of the affected paleontological sites;
2. Include standards for further testing, sampling, documentation, data recovery, preservation and protection, analysis, and report preparation;

3. Outline an effective preservation plan or data recovery and documentation plan for those resources that the paleontologist has determined to have significant research or other value;

4. Provide a schedule for the implementation of the treatment plan; and

5. Provide a cost estimate for mitigation strategies, including testing, data recovery, curation, and report preparation.

**Mitigation Measure EPU-1: Utility Disruption.**

Design, construction, and inspection of required utility work would be completed in accordance with applicable statutes. Where feasible, utility relocations would be undertaken in advance of Project construction. SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with affected service providers to ensure that all utility work is performed in accordance with appropriate requirements and criteria. Coordination with the utility providers would be initiated during the preliminary engineering phase of the Project and would continue through final design and construction. Coordination efforts would include planning for utility re-routes, identification of any other potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies for overcoming problems that may arise to ensure minimum disruption of utility service or operation during the utility work and Project construction.

If unexpected underground utilities are encountered, the construction contractor would coordinate with the utility provider to develop plans to address the utility conflict, protect the utility if needed, and limit service interruptions. Any short-term, limited service interruptions of known utilities would be scheduled well in advance, and appropriate notification would be provided to users.

SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with all utility providers during the design phase of the Project to incorporate effective design treatments and construction procedures to avoid adverse impacts to existing utilities and traffic during construction. Nonetheless, the potential exists for construction activities to encounter unexpected utilities. In addition, utility relocations may require short-term, limited interruptions of service. No interference to existing utility services is anticipated during the realignment of the overhead power transmission lines, because PG&E and SMUD would put customer loads on alternate lines until the connections are re-established.

**Mitigation Measure HZ-1: Site Investigation.**

To mitigate the potential for encountering unknown contaminated soil and/or groundwater in the Project area, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be conducted along the proposed alignment and MSFs in areas where excavation or subsurface disturbance will take place close to sites with listed known soil or groundwater contamination. The Phase I
investigation will be done during the design phase and completed prior to the completion of final design. The purpose of the Phase I investigation will be to determine whether suspected contamination, as listed in the records search, is actually present on the property, and if additional site characterization is necessary prior to implementation of the Project to protect the public and environment from harm. The Phase I investigation may include activities such as geophysical surveys, drilling, trenching, soil sampling, soil gas sampling, ground water sampling, and surface water sampling. If the Phase I investigation finds that additional site characterization is necessary prior to implementation of the Project to protect the public and environment from harm, then a Phase II investigation shall be required for areas where soil and/or groundwater contamination are suspected. The Phase II investigation will be conducted to determine the nature and extent of contamination. If the Phase II investigation concludes there is a potential to encounter contaminated materials (during and post-construction), then a soil and groundwater management plan shall be developed and implemented. The soil and groundwater management plan shall provide detailed procedures to be followed in the event that contaminated materials are encountered (during and post-construction).

**Mitigation Measure NV-1: Implement Wheel Noise Control Measures.**

Resilient wheels or suitable equivalent noise control measures shall be implemented that achieves a reduction of wheel squeal to Moderate or No Impact level, as defined by the FTA noise criteria.

**Mitigation Measure NV-2: Substation Design.**

To alleviate noise impacts from substation operation, noise impacts from substation operation will be mitigated in one of the following ways:

- Locate traction power substations at a distance farther from noise-sensitive receptors than the screening distance determined in this analysis.
- Re-evaluate the inside buffer during engineering design, and if necessary, install efficient enclosures to meet local noise threshold criteria.
- Place traction power substations in underground utility vaults.

**Mitigation Measure NV-3: MSF Facilities.**

To avoid noise impacts from the MSF facilities in West Sacramento, install sound walls around the MSF in West Sacramento. A perimeter wall that is 6 to 8 feet high would minimize noise from the MSF at this location.

**Mitigation Measure NV-4: Vibration Control.**

To avoid vibration-related impacts from streetcar operations:

- Additional measurements, including soil vibration propagation testing, shall be made during the engineering design phase to evaluate the potential for efficient soil
propagation at distances beyond 50 feet, site-specific vibration propagation, and the effects on vibration transmission into those buildings identified as being impacted in the current analysis.

- If streetcar operational speeds are 30 to 35 mph, then various forms of vibration control will need to be investigated during the engineering phase of the Project. There are different measures available depending on the level of vibration reduction required. For the highest level of reduction indicated for the Project (e.g., 13 VdB), a floating slab track may be implemented. Where lower levels of vibration reduction are required (e.g., 5 VdB or less), it may be possible to use a resilient ballast mat if the track design permits this approach, similar to that implemented at SFMTA. At special trackwork (i.e., crossover), it should be possible to implement “flange-bearing frogs,” as has been accomplished elsewhere (e.g., SFMTA). The majority of vibration impacts due to streetcar operations would be eliminated if the streetcar speeds were reduced to 20 mph or less. In the City of Sacramento, the remaining vibration impacts at 20 mph or less would occur at the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament and the Cathedral Building Apartments where a crossover is to be located. As with the case where speeds are 30 to 35 mph, a flange-bearing frog would control vibration from such special trackwork. Assuming mitigation of flange bearing frog is implemented, then for the remaining receptors impacted at a vehicle speed of 20 mph the vibration level would be reduced if operating speeds were lower. The predicted level for 20 mph with flange bearing frog are 1 dB over criterion. Speed reduction would be minimal (e.g., 18 mph instead of 20mph).


To control the potential impacts to the nearby community during construction of the Project, the following array of mitigation strategies would be employed:

- Locate noisy equipment as far as possible from noise-sensitive receptors. In addition, temporary barriers should be employed around the equipment.
- Use temporary noise barriers along the Project right-of-way. Barriers/curtains must achieve a Sound Transmission Class of 30 or greater in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTM) Test Method E90, and be constructed from material having a surface density of at least 2 pounds per square foot to ensure adequate transmission loss.
- Use sound absorption for temporary barriers in the area of Downtown Sacramento. In this area, a reverberant environment is produced due to the narrow distance between buildings and hard pavement surfaces. Line the inner face of the temporary barrier or use a curtain with an absorptive face. The absorptive liner or absorptive face should have a Noise Reduction Coefficient rating of 0.70 or greater, in accordance to ASTM Test Method C423.
- Require ambient-sensitive (“smart”) backup alarms, SAE Class D, or limit to SAE Class C (97 dB).
- Fit silencers to combustion engines. Ensure that equipment has quality mufflers installed, in good working condition.
- Switch off engines or reduce to idle when not in use.
- Lubricate and maintain equipment regularly. Equipment is normally quieter when well maintained.
- Construction-related truck traffic should be re-routed along roadways that would produce the least disturbance to sensitive receptors.

**Mitigation Measure NV-6: Vibration Monitoring.**

To avoid vibration-induced annoyance impacts due to construction activities, the activities should be kept below the FTA impact criteria for each land use category. Equipment and methods selected by the contractor to reduce the potential for annoyance will be reviewed and approved by the Project proponent. Possible mitigation strategies that will be implemented to ensure vibration-induced annoyance does not exceed the impact criteria include:

- Avoid the use of pavement breakers. Instead, use a hoe ram with hydraulic chisel.
- Avoid the use of dynamic compaction at a distance closer than 25 feet from any sensitive receptors, or use alternative methods of compaction in areas of construction that would be closer than 25 feet from sensitive receptors.
- Monitor vibration during construction to ensure compliance with criteria for building damage for buildings within 40 feet of construction activities. Conduct a preconstruction crack survey of these buildings.
- Plan routes for hauling material out of the Project site that would cause the least impact (annoyance). Propose truck routes along roads where the sensitive receptors are at least 75 feet from the street centerline.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Implement temporary bicycle detours during construction.**

Bicycle detours will be devised and publicized in advance of streetcar construction. Alternatively, it may be possible to route bicycles along short sidewalk segments, depending on the pedestrian volumes along the sidewalk.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Develop Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan.**

The Project sponsor will develop a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan that will be subject to review and approval by the City of West Sacramento Traffic Engineer, the City of Sacramento Department of Transportation, Caltrans, and local emergency service providers, including the fire and police departments. The plan will ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained during construction. At a minimum, the plan will include:

- The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures;
- Time of day of arrival and departure of trucks;
- Limitations on the size and type of trucks, provision of a staging area with a limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting;
- Provision of a truck circulation pattern;
- Provision of driveway access plan so that safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movements are maintained (e.g., steel plates, minimum distances of open trenches, and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas);
- Maintain safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles;
- Manual traffic control when necessary;
- Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures; and
- Provisions for pedestrian safety.

A copy of the construction traffic management plan will be submitted to local emergency response agencies, and these agencies will be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct roadways.

**Mitigation TRA-3: Coordinate construction activities with the U.S. Coast Guard.**

If construction activities limit or impede use of the lift mechanism of the Tower Bridge during intermittent or extended periods, the U.S. Coast Guard will be informed of these occurrences a minimum of 30 days in advance of the interruption to navigational traffic. The U.S. Coast Guard will post notice of the temporary closure in the Federal Register, and businesses and boat owners that would be most affected by the obstruction of navigation will be notified individually. The Project sponsor will coordinate with Caltrans, the owner of the Tower Bridge, the U.S. Coast Guard, and affected businesses/boat owners to minimize or alleviate the potential impact by providing proper notification of the bridge closures; by scheduling closures in the non-peak excursion season (October through April); or by raising the bridge for an extended time to allow continuous river navigation, while temporarily rerouting vehicular and non-motorized traffic.

______________________________
Kirk Trost
Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to present public comments and responses to comments received on the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS/MND) for the proposed Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project. The EA/IS/MND is a joint document prepared in compliance with both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County Transit District, and Sacramento Regional Transit, have undertaken advanced planning, environmental, and engineering activities for the reintroduction of streetcar service to connect the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento and their shared riverfront. The purpose of the Project is to improve transit service and local circulation by connecting West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento with an alternative (non-auto) mode, and supporting existing and future development in the City of West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento. The 3.3-mile streetcar alignment would extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown entertainment and retail district in Sacramento. The alignment for the proposed streetcar is primarily along existing city streets. The proposed project includes the installation of station platforms and associated traction power facilities (support poles, catenary poles, and substations). Two potential sites are being considered for a maintenance and storage facility. Both are located on property owned by Caltrans and are situated beneath the Business 80/50 elevated freeway in Sacramento and West Sacramento. The project is partially funded by the Federal Transit Authority (FTA).

The EA/IS/MND was released for public review and comment by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments on May 15, 2015. The public review period ended on June 22, 2015. Comments were received from five (4) public agencies and one (1) individual prior to the close of the review period. Another two comment letters were received after the close of the public review period but have been included in this document.

Table 1 List of Commenters on the EA/IS/MND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Email Comments</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Trevor Cleak</td>
<td>Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>May 27, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Scott Morgan</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>June 17, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lynne Stevenson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>June 21, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 P.A. Gonzales</td>
<td>Department of California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>June 22, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Angela Verbaere</td>
<td>California Department of General Services</td>
<td>June 22, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rob Ferrara</td>
<td>Sacramento Municipal Utility District</td>
<td>June 26, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cy R. Oggins</td>
<td>California State Lands Commission</td>
<td>June 26, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] §15074[b]), the decision-making body of the lead agency must consider the IS/MND and comments received before approving the project. CEQA does not require written responses to comments received on an IS/MND; however, SACOG has reviewed the comments received and prepared responses to provide full information to the decision-makers and the public. SACOG, as the CEQA lead agency, has evaluated all substantive comments received on the EA/IS/MND, and has determined that in no instance do the comments result in the identification of new or previously unidentified significant environmental effects. This document will be provided to the SACOG Transportation Committee as the decision-making body.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The following sections provide responses to comments received on the IS/MND. It should be noted that portions of the comment letters contain standard information and statements that are not directly pertinent to the adequacy and content of the EA/IS/MND. Responses to substantive comments are provided in the form of individual responses to comment letters received. Comment letters are followed immediately by the numbered responses to each letter and comment.
27 May 2015

Kirk Trost
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

CERTIFIED MAIL
7014 2870 0000 7535 3688

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, DOWNTOWN RIVERFRONT STREETCAR PROJECT, SCH# 2015052050, SACRAMENTO AND YOLO COUNTIES

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse’s 18 May 2015 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the Request for Review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project, located in Sacramento and Yolo Counties.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

Construction Storm Water General Permit
Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

---

1 Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.
Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification
If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

Waste Discharge Requirements
If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project will require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture
If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agricultural, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group. Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board’s website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/app_approval/index.shtml; or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

2. Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order RS-2013-0100. Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently $1,084 + $6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory
RESPONSE TO LETTER 1 - COMMENT 1

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board has commented that their agency is designated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and ground waters of the state and has provided general requirements for permits for projects affecting waters of the state as well as waters of the United States. The EA/IS/MND addresses state and federal regulations regarding surface and ground waters in Sections 4.3, 4.5, and 4.8. The EA/IS/MND also identifies the need to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board in Section 3.2, Permits Required. No additional response is required.
June 17, 2015

Kirk Trost
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project
SCH#: 2015052050

Dear Kirk Trost:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on June 16, 2015, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
SCH# 2015052050  
Project Title Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project  
Lead Agency Sacramento Area Council of Governments  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>MND Mitigated Negative Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SACOG, the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County Transit District, and Sacramento Regional Transit, have undertaken planning, environmental, and engineering activities for the reintroduction of the streetcar to connect the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento and their shared riverfront. The purpose of the Project is to improve transit service and local circulation with an alternative (non-auto) mode, and supporting existing and future development in the Cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento. The 3.3-mile streetcar alignment would extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown entertainment and retail district in Sacramento. New track, station platform and traction power facilities would be constructed within existing street rights-of-way. Maintenance facilities would be located on Caltrans owned property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency Contact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Kirk Trost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>916 340 6210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1415 L Street, Suite 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sacramento, Yolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Sacramento, West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat/Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>I-5/I-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>8-9N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4-5E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>MDB&amp;M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proximity to:    |  |
| Highways         | I-5, 80, US 50 |
| Airports         |                |
| Railways         | UPRR           |
| Waterways        | Sacramento River |
| Schools          | Westfield Village |
| Land Use         |                |

| Project Issues   | Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Landuse; Cumulative Effects |
| Reviewing Agencies | Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 2; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3 S; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission |

| Date Received    | 05/18/2015 |
| Start of Review  | 05/18/2015 |
| End of Review    | 06/16/2015 |

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 2 - COMMENT 1

The State Clearinghouse (SCH) has provided notification that the SCH submitted the EA/IS/MND to selected agencies for review and acknowledges that SACOG has complied with the SCH review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to CEQA. No response is required.
From: Lynne Stevenson [mailto:lstevenson249@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2015 8:42 AM
To: EAISComments
Subject: Draft EAIS Streetcar Project

June 21, 2015

Dear Mr. Trost:

Thank you for opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS) for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project dated May 2015. I live in Midtown, and I have family in West Sacramento. As such, I am particularly interested in the proposed project. I have the following comments on the draft EA:

1. 40 CFR 1508.13 states: “Finding of no significant impact” means a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why an action...will not have a significant [author emphasis] effect on the human environment and ....” To reach such a finding, the significance of any effects, not just whether they would be adverse or beneficial, needs to be evaluated and determined to be less than significant after implementation of avoidance, minimization, or mitigation. This draft document identifies effects and then proposes mitigation to reach determinations of “no adverse effect” for most of the resources in Chapter 4.0. Please either revise the document to determine the level of significance of effects (i.e., less than significance, potentially significant, or significant) before and after mitigation; or explain the Federal lead agency’s rationale for not determining the significance per CEQ regulations.

2. 40 CFR 1502.16 states: “It [Environmental Consequences section] shall include discussions of: (a) Direct effects and their significance (1508.8). (b) Indirect effects and their significance (1508.8).” While Sections 4.3, 4.6, and 4.9 specifically address direct and indirect effects, the other sections in Chapter 4.0 do not. However, other terms including “temporary,” “permanent,” “short-term” and “long-term” are used in the other sections and seem to mean the same as “direct” and “indirect.” Please revise Chapter 4.0, as necessary, to improve the consistency in wording, as well as ensure that the document complies with CEQ regulations.

I look forward to reviewing the responses/revisions in the final EA/IS.

Sincerely,

Lynne Stevenson
2316 Capitol Avenue #7
Sacramento, California  95816
RESPONSE TO LETTER 3 - COMMENT 1

This comment addresses National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements related to a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Specifically, that “the significance of any effects, not just whether they would be adverse or beneficial, needs to be evaluated and determined to be less than significant after implementation of avoidance, minimization, or mitigation.” FTA is the federal lead agency for the project and has prepared the EA consistent with Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR part 771). Pursuant to Section 771.121, Findings of no significant impact:

(a) The Administration will review the EA and any public hearing comments and other comments received regarding the EA. If the Administration agrees with the applicant's recommendations pursuant to §771.119(g), it will make a separate written FONSI incorporating by reference the EA and any other appropriate environmental documents.

The FONSI is currently under development, pending completion of the public review and CEQA process. The FONSI will meet the requirements of NEPA and will further address NEPA effects determinations.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 3 - COMMENT 2

The commenter cites NEPA requirements for addressing both direct effects and indirect effects within the environmental consequences analysis. 40 CFR 1508.8 defines direct and indirect effects as follows:

(a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.

(b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

The general methodology section of Chapter 4 of the EA/IS states that the analysis assesses both direct impacts (an effect that is caused by an action and occurs at the same time and place) and indirect impacts (an effect that is caused by an action but is later in time or farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable). The analysis of environmental impacts considers the context, duration, intensity, and type of impact. Given the nature of the project, not all environmental resources are subject to indirect effects. The Commenter states that only EA/IS/MND sections 4.3, 4.6, and 4.9 address direct and indirect effects; however, indirect effects are also specifically addressed in Sections 4.2, 4.4, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13, as appropriate.

All impacts of the proposed project were analyzed in sufficient detail in the MND to allow the decision makers to be appropriately informed as to the project’s effects.
June 22, 2015

Mr. Kirk Trost
Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: How to comment on the EA/IS

Dear Mr. Kirk Trost,

After review, the California Highway Patrol, Capitol Protection Section, has noted a few concerns with the proposed Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project. The first concern is the placement of the tracks and platform. According to the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project’s website, www.riverfrontstreetcar.com, the proposed tracks and station will be located at 12th and L Street. Presently, 12th and L Street provides critical ingress/egress for State Senators and Assembly Members as well as other Dignitaries conducting business at the State Capitol. The north driveway entrance/exit at 12th Street also serves as an entrance for emergency personnel and vehicles to access the State Capitol. Should the proposed Streetcar run along the south side of L Street and if the proposed platform is built on the south side of L Street, there will be times when the access to the driveway will, or could be, potentially blocked, effectively crippling a major artery to the Capitol. Members of the Legislature, Dignitaries and Emergency Vehicles alike will be forced to use the only other access, which is located at 12th and N Street. Due to the configuration of the one way streets that surround the State Capitol, as well as Capitol Park which spans from 12th to 15th Street, the 12th and N Street driveway access to the Capitol can take a significant amount of time to respond to from 12th and L Street if access is blocked.

The second concern again pertains to the placement of the tracks and station. According to the Public Notice description of the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project, the new station platforms, “would be concrete slabs constructed within the sidewalk and/or roadbed and would not require removal of any existing granite curbs or street trees.” If the concrete slabs that will serve as the station platform are raised and placed on the south side of L Street, they could potentially block a major access point to Capitol Park. Presently, on L Street, just east of 12th Street, there is a large asphalt pedestrian walkway that leads into Capitol Park and to the East entrance of the State Capitol. The walkway is protected by a hydraulic bollard system that can be lowered to allow Fire Departments, Ambulances and Law Enforcement vehicles into Capitol Park. The walkway also serves as an exit for all of the aforementioned vehicles, if they enter from the N Street side bollard system. Since the walkways are narrow, in relation to the size of a
normal street, and since there are numerous large trees that line a major portion of the walkway, it would be difficult for large vehicles, like Fire Engines, to enter and turn around if they were unable to exit at L Street and 12th Street due to a raised platform.

The final concern pertains to the safety of pedestrians. The Capitol plays host to numerous large events, demonstrations and rallies every year. Oftentimes, groups elect to march around the perimeter of the Capitol. The marches have the potential to interfere with normal operation of the proposed Streetcar, if it is located on the south side of L Street. Demonstrators could be funneled through the station as they march around Capitol Park. This could disrupt people waiting to board the Streetcar, in the event a march proceeds through the station as the streetcar arrives. People waiting for the Streetcar could potentially be blocked by the marchers, therefore missing their opportunity to board. This could also lead to blocking the path of the Streetcar, since oftentimes groups marching span the entire sidewalk and spill over into the street parking area while marching. The marches have the tendency to get very loud due to chanting or sound amplification systems. Therefore, the noise created by the marchers has the potential to drown out the auditory warning of an approaching Streetcar, thus creating a safety hazard for the pedestrians participating in the march.

I you have any questions please contact me at (916) 322-3337.

Sincerely,

P. A. Gonzales, Captain
Commander
RESPONSE TO LETTER 4 - COMMENT 1

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has expressed the concern that the proposed placement of streetcar tracks and a station platform at 12th and I Streets blocks critical access to the State Capitol building for members of the legislature, dignitaries and emergency vehicles. The streetcar station platforms are planned to be located such that no existing driveways or pedestrian paths are blocked or prevent access. The areas constructed as station platforms would only be 8" above the top of the streetcar track. By comparison, the typical street curb is 6" high. The streetcar platform is expected to be constructed in roughly the location of the on-street parking stalls, so the perimeter sidewalk and pathways should not be affected by the construction of the streetcar platform. As the project design progresses the project team will meet with stakeholders to discuss station platform locations, design amenities and details specific to each proposed station platform location.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 4 - COMMENT 2

The CHP has also expressed the concern that the proposed placement of tracks and platform at 12th and I Streets obstructs the pedestrian walkway that leads to Capitol Park and serves as ingress/egress for emergency vehicles. See Response to Letter 4 - Comment 1, above.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 4 - COMMENT 3

The CHP has commented that the project could affect the safety of pedestrians during large events, demonstrations and rallies at the State Capitol. Specifically, marches could interfere with Streetcar operation and noise associated with marches could “drown out the auditory warning of an approaching Streetcar.” As discussed in Section 4.13.3 of the EA/IS/MND, existing transit facilities are located in proximity to the capitol. These include both bus and light rail. It is not anticipated that the addition of streetcar service would substantially affect pedestrian safety at large events, marches and other gatherings. The addition of streetcar service may actually reduce congestion and concomitant pedestrian safety while providing an alternative transportation mode for those accessing large events.
June 22, 2015

Mr. Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Trost:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project Environmental Assessment Initial Study dated May 2015. Although, Measure B was not approved by the voters in June 2015, the State of California Department of General Services (DGS) has the following comments for your consideration when funding is secured and proceeds to move forward as planned.

DGS requires safe, uninterrupted access to State-owned facilities and parking lots in the areas affected by the streetcar construction on L Street from 11th Street through 16th Street. Prior to project activities on L Street, it is essential that the city of Sacramento, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and Regional Transit coordinates with DGS to provide non-restricted access to the State Capitol Park and the California East End Complex (CEEC) office buildings during construction.

In addition, the study identifies two streetcar platforms located on L Street adjacent to the State Capitol Park near 11th Street, and at the corner of 16th and L Streets in front of an existing CEEC retail establishment. The state has a concern in regards to loitering, safety, and cleanliness around the platform locations, in particular after daylight hours; trash receptacles need to be provided at each platform and maintained on a regular basis, and the surrounding areas should be kept clean and safe for visitors, state employees, and the general public.

In discussions with the California Highway Patrol (CHP), Capitol Protection Section, a major concern is related to the placement of the tracks and platform station on L Street near the 12th Street entrance to the State Capitol Building. The proposed location of the platform will close the access at 12th Street for the Legislature, Dignitaries, and Emergency Vehicles. A separate comment letter from CHP will advise that the platform be relocated away from the 12th Street entrance.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments. If you have any questions, please contact Ken Uribe of my staff at (916) 376-1810.

Sincerely,

Angela Verbaere, Assistant Chief
Asset Management Branch
Department of General Services

cc: Cathy Buck, Supervising Real Estate Officer, Asset Management Branch, Real Estate Services Division, Department of General Services
RESPONSE TO LETTER 5 - COMMENT 1

The California Department of General Services (DGS) has commented that it requires safe, uninterrupted access to State-owned facilities and parking lots affected by Streetcar construction on L Street, between 12th and 16th Streets and stresses the need for SACOG and Regional Transit to coordinate with DGS to provide non-restricted access to both the State Capitol Park and the California East End Complex during construction. The EA/IS/MND includes the following mitigation measure to address construction-related effects to traffic and parking:

**Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Develop Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan.**

The Project sponsor will develop a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan that will be subject to review and approval by the City of West Sacramento Traffic Engineer, the City of Sacramento Department of Transportation, Caltrans, and local emergency service providers, including the fire and police departments. The plan will ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained during construction. At a minimum, the plan will include:

- The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures;
- Time of day of arrival and departure of trucks;
- Limitations on the size and type of trucks, provision of a staging area with a limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting;
- Provision of a truck circulation pattern;
- Provision of driveway access plan so that safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movements are maintained (e.g., steel plates, minimum distances of open trenches, and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas);
- Maintain safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles;
- Manual traffic control when necessary;
- Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures; and
- Provisions for pedestrian safety.

A copy of the construction traffic management plan will be submitted to local emergency response agencies, and these agencies will be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct roadways.

As noted above in the Response to Letter 4 – Comment 1, as the project design progresses the project team will meet with stakeholders to discuss station platform locations, design amenities and details specific to each proposed station platform location.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 5 - COMMENT 2

DGS has expressed concerns regarding loitering, safety and cleanliness around proposed station platforms in proximity to Capitol Park along L Street at 12th and 16th streets and request that the areas include trash receptacles and be maintained on a regular basis. As noted above in the Response to Letter 4 – Comment 1, as the project design progresses the project team will meet with stakeholders to discuss station platform locations, design amenities and details specific to each proposed station platform location.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 5 - COMMENT 3

DGS reiterates CHP’s comments regarding the placement of tracks and the station platform near the 12th Street entrance to the State Capitol building. As stated in the Response to Letter 4 – Comment 1, the streetcar station platforms are planned to be located such that no existing driveways or pedestrian paths are blocked or prevent access. The areas constructed as station platforms would only be 8" above the top of the streetcar track. By comparison, the typical street curb is 6" high. The streetcar platform is expected to be constructed in roughly the location of the on-street parking stalls, so the perimeter sidewalk and pathways should not be affected by the construction of the streetcar platform. As the project design progresses the project team will meet with stakeholders to discuss station platform locations, design amenities and details specific to each proposed station platform location.
June 26, 2015

Kirk Trost
Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Environmental Assessment (EA)/Initial Study (IS)/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project

Dear Mr. Trost,

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the EA/IS/MND, Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project. SMUD is the primary energy provider for Sacramento County and the proposed project area. SMUD’s vision is to empower our customers with solutions and options that increase energy efficiency, protect the environment, reduce global warming, and lower the cost to serve our region. As a Responsible Agency, SMUD aims to ensure that the proposed project limits the potential for significant environmental effects on SMUD facilities, employees, and customers.

Based on our review of the EA/IS/MND and our understanding of the proposed project, SMUD offers the following input:

1. **Project Description:** SMUD appreciates the information provided in the EA/MND Project Description. SMUD would like to continue coordination with the lead agency/project applicant and be kept aware of any potential impact of the proposed project on SMUD facilities. SMUD currently has extensive subsurface utility infrastructure located throughout the project area and looks forward to continuing our partnership with the lead agency, project applicant, and other responsible agencies in finding solutions to avoiding any potential impacts to these facilities.

2. **Project Schedule:** SMUD would like to see a discussion of the project timing/phasing included in the EA/MND in order to ensure that adequate time is available to address SMUD’s infrastructure relocation timeline.

3. **Energy Delivery (Infrastructure):** The EA/MND should provide a brief discussion of the proposed on-site and off-site energy infrastructure improvements needed to construct and operate the proposed project. SMUD staff is available to provide additional information and support material, as it pertains to electrical infrastructure improvements in the City of Sacramento.
SMUD appreciates being kept apprised of the planning, development, and completion of this project. We aim to be partners in the efficient and sustainable delivery of the proposed project. Please ensure that the information included in this response is conveyed to the project planners and the appropriate project proponents.

Environmental leadership is a core value of SMUD and we look forward to collaborating with you on this project. Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the EA/MND. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jose Bodipo-Memba, SMUD Environmental Specialist at (916) 732-6493. Jose will be the primary environmental point of contact for SMUD on this project.

Sincerely,

Rob Ferrera
Environmental Specialist
Environmental Management
Legislative & Regulatory Affairs
Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Cc: Jose Bodipo-Memba
    Mike Wirsch
    Mike Deis
    Steve Johns
    Beth Tincher
    Pat Durham
    Joseph Schofield
RESPONSE TO LETTER 6 - COMMENT 1

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) has provided the comment that they would like to continue coordination with the lead agency/project applicant and be kept aware of any potential impact of the proposed project on SMUD facilities. They also state that they look forward to continuing our partnership with the lead agency, project applicant, and other responsible agencies in finding solutions to avoiding any potential impacts to SMUD facilities. Coordination is ongoing with SMUD. In addition, the EA/IS/MND specifically address the potential for utility relocations and temporary service disruptions and includes the following mitigation measure to address potential effects:

Mitigation Measure EPU-1: Utility Disruption.

Design, construction, and inspection of required utility work would be completed in accordance with applicable statutes. Where feasible, utility relocations would be undertaken in advance of Project construction. SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with affected service providers to ensure that all utility work is performed in accordance with appropriate requirements and criteria. Coordination with the utility providers would be initiated during the preliminary engineering phase of the Project and would continue through final design and construction. Coordination efforts would include planning for utility re-routes, identification of any other potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies for overcoming problems that may arise to ensure minimum disruption of utility service or operation during the utility work and Project construction.

If unexpected underground utilities are encountered, the construction contractor would coordinate with the utility provider to develop plans to address the utility conflict, protect the utility if needed, and limit service interruptions. Any short-term, limited service interruptions of known utilities would be scheduled well in advance, and appropriate notification would be provided to users.

SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with all utility providers during the design phase of the Project to incorporate effective design treatments and construction procedures to avoid adverse impacts to existing utilities and traffic during construction. Nonetheless, the potential exists for construction activities to encounter unexpected utilities. In addition, utility relocations may require short-term, limited interruptions of service. No interference to existing utility services is anticipated during the realignment of the overhead power transmission lines, because PG&E and SMUD would put customer loads on alternate lines until the connections are re-established.

All environmental effects of the proposed project were analyzed in sufficient detail in the EA/IS/MND to allow the decision makers to be appropriately informed as to the project’s effects.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 6 - COMMENT 2

SMUD has commented that they would like to see a discussion of the project timing/phasing included in the EA/IS/MND in order to ensure that adequate time is available to address SMUD’s infrastructure relocation timeline. As currently discussed in the EA/IS/MND, Construction, start-up, and testing of the system would take approximately 21 months. Utility relocations that cannot be
avoided would be completed first and will be coordinated with utility providers; specific locations and timing are not known at this time. See Response to Letter 6 – Comment 2, above. All environmental effects of the proposed project were analyzed in sufficient detail in the EA/IS/MND to allow the decision makers to be appropriately informed as to the project’s effects.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 6 - COMMENT 3

SMUD suggests that the EA/IS/MND should provide a brief discussion of the proposed on-site and off-site energy infrastructure improvements needed to construct and operate the proposed project. The EA/IS/MND describes the traction power facilities (support poles, catenary poles, and substations) needed for the project and noted that for reliability purposes, the streetcar line will be powered by two additional substations in West Sacramento. The OCS system will be designed during the final design phase of the project and will be coordinated with SMUD at that time. All environmental effects of the proposed project were analyzed in sufficient detail in the EA/IS/MND to allow the decision makers to be appropriately informed as to the project’s effects.
June 26, 2015

File Ref: SCH #2015052050

Kirk Trost
Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project, Sacramento and Yolo Counties

Dear Mr. Trost:

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) staff has reviewed the subject MND for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project), which is being prepared by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (Council). The Council, as a public agency proposing to carry out a project, is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.). The CSLC is a trustee agency for projects that could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands and their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses. Additionally, because the Project involves work on sovereign lands, the CSLC will act as a responsible agency.

**CSLC Jurisdiction and Public Trust Lands**

The CSLC has jurisdiction and management authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable lakes and waterways. The CSLC also has certain residual and review authority for tidelands and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6301, 6306). All tidelands and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable lakes and waterways, are subject to the protections of the Common Law Public Trust.

As general background, the State of California acquired sovereign ownership of all tidelands and submerged lands and beds of navigable lakes and waterways upon its admission to the United States in 1850. The State holds these lands for the benefit of
all people of the State for statewide Public Trust purposes, which include but are not limited to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water-related recreation, habitat preservation, and open space. On navigable non-tidal waterways, including lakes, the State holds fee ownership of the bed of the waterway landward to the ordinary low water mark and a Public Trust easement landward to the ordinary high water mark, except where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. Such boundaries may not be readily apparent from present day site inspections.

Based upon the information provided and a review of in-house records, CSLC staff has determined that a portion of the Project will cross State-owned sovereign land in the Sacramento River, which is under jurisdiction of the CSLC. On December 21, 1949, the CSLC authorized a Right-of-Way Permit, PRC 422.9, to the California Department of Transportation for the construction, use and maintenance of the Tower Bridge. As the Project continues, CSLC staff requests the Council and FTA contact George Asimakopoulos (see contact information below) to determine whether the Project or any components of the Project at the Tower Bridge require a lease and formal authorization from the CSLC for the use of sovereign land.

**Project Description**

The Council proposes to construct a 3.3 mile streetcar alignment to meet its objectives and needs as follows:

- Improve transit service and local circulation by connecting West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento with non-auto transportation; and
- Support existing and future development in West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento.

From the Project Description, CSLC staff understands that the Project would include the following components:

- **New Streetcar Track.** Track for the streetcars would be installed on existing city streets, including across the Tower Bridge, with the exception of some new track extending to the Sacramento Intermodal Transit Facility.
- **Streetcar Stations.** A total of 25 stations would be constructed; the stations would consist of concrete slabs within the sidewalk or roadway with a berthing area of 60 to 65 feet in length and a boarding area of 40 to 45 feet in length. Station elements may include amenities such as a canopy mounted on structural supports, supplemental lighting, fare machines, schedule, and a patron information rack.
- **Power Facilities.** Traction power facilities for the streetcars would be located within the public right-of-way.
- **Maintenance and Storage Facility.** The Project proposes two potential sites for maintenance and storage of the streetcars beneath the Business 80/50 elevated freeway. The facility would accommodate routine vehicle inspections, interior/exterior cleaning of the streetcars, preventative maintenance, and component change-out.
Environmental Review

CSLC staff requests that the Council consider the following comments on the Project's MND.

General Comments

1. Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program: Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is required as part of project approval (see State CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15074, subd. (d), 15097). MMRPs are commonly included in Draft MNDs to facilitate public review but are not required to be included; the MND circulated for public review for this Project did not include an MMRP. CSLC staff recommends an MMRP be included as part of the Final MND to ensure transparency and public disclosure. The MMRP should include methods for coordination, timing for implementation of mitigation measures and list all parties and/or agencies, in addition to the Council and FTA, responsible for ensuring compliance and enforcement through permit conditions, agreements or other measures during each phase of the Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the MND for the Project. As a responsible and trustee agency, the CSLC will need to rely on the Final MND for the issuance of any new lease as specified above and, therefore, we request that you consider our comments prior to adoption of the MND.

Please send copies of future Project-related documents, including electronic copies of the Final MND, MMRP, and Notice of Determination (NOD), when they become available, and refer questions concerning environmental review to Holly Wyer, Environmental Scientist, at (916) 574-2399 or via e-mail at Holly.Wyer@slc.ca.gov. For questions concerning CSLC leasing jurisdiction, please contact George Asimakopoulos, Public Land Management Specialist, at (916) 574-0990, or via email at George.Asimakopoulos@slc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cy R. Oggins, Chief
Division of Environmental Planning and Management

cc: Office of Planning and Research
H. Wyer, CSLC
G. Asimakopoulos, CSLC
S. Blackmon, CSLC
RESPONSE TO LETTER 7, COMMENT 1

In this comment the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) states that review of the project has determined that a portion of the Project will cross State-owned sovereign land at the Sacramento River which is under jurisdiction of the CSLC and that they have previously authorized a right-of-way permit to Caltrans for construction, use and maintenance of the Tower Bridge. They request that CSLC staff be contacted regarding the possible requirements for a lease and formal authorization from CSLC for the use of sovereign land. Comment noted. Permitting activities will commence after approval of the project and adoption of the MND, during final design.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 7, COMMENT 2

CLSC staff recommends that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be included as part of the final MND. An MMRP is required pursuant to CEQA and will be adopted by SACOG at the time of MND adoption and project approval. The MMRP will be prepared consistent with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and the CEQA Guidelines sections 15091(d) and 15097). The MMRP will be kept on file with SACOG.
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INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar Project (Project). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to report on and monitor measures adopted as part of the environmental review process (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and the CEQA Guidelines sections 15091(d) and 15097). This MMRP is intended to fulfill that requirement.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, Yolo County Transit District (YCTD), and Sacramento Regional Transit (RT), have undertaken advanced planning, environmental, and engineering activities for the reintroduction of streetcar service to connect the cities of West Sacramento and Sacramento and their shared riverfront. The purpose of the Project is to improve transit service and local circulation by connecting West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento with an alternative (non-auto) mode, and supporting existing and future development in the City of West Sacramento and Downtown Sacramento. The 3.3-mile streetcar alignment would extend from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown entertainment and retail district in Sacramento. The alignment for the proposed streetcar is primarily along existing city streets. The proposed project includes the installation of station platforms and associated traction power facilities (support poles, catenary poles, and substations). Two potential sites are being considered for a maintenance and storage facility. Both are located on property owned by Caltrans and are situated beneath the Business 80/50 elevated freeway in Sacramento and West Sacramento.

The Project is partially funded by the Federal Transit Authority (FTA). A joint the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/CEQA Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS/MND) was released for public review and comment by the SACOG and FTA on May 19, 2015.

SACOG is the CEQA Lead Agency and must adopt the MMRP for development and operation of the Project. Given the number of agencies involved in project planning, design and implementation, a Project Management Team (PMT) was created that includes staff from each of the agencies (the City of Sacramento, the City of West Sacramento, YCTD, RT and Caltrans. The PMT provides technical direction, leadership and management for the project and, with SACOG’s oversight as CEQA Lead Agency, will be responsible for implementing the mitigation.

This MMRP is designed to ensure that the measures identified in the EA/IS/MND for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project are fully implemented. This MMRP describes the actions that
must take place as a part of each measure, the timing of these actions, the entity responsible for
implementation, and the agency responsible for enforcing each action.

The MMRP, the EA/IS/MND, and supporting technical studies will be kept on file with SACOG, 1415 L
Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814. Inquiries should be directed to:

Sabrina Bradbury
Public Information Coordinator
SACOG
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-340-6211

PURPOSE OF THE MMRP

The intent of the MMRP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of adopted mitigation
measures. Additionally, for the purposes of public disclosure and to assist in monitoring compliance, the
MMRP describes actions necessary to comply with relevant regulatory requirements discussed in the
EA/IS. The MMRP is intended to be used by SACOG staff, the PMT, and other responsible agencies
during project design, construction and operation. It is intended to be included in contract (bid and award)
documents so that measures are fully accommodated (both budget and schedule) before and during
construction.

In order to assist in the implementation of the mitigation measures, the MMRP includes the following
information:

Mitigation Measures. The mitigation measures are reproduced from the EA/IS/MND prepared for the
proposed project, and are assigned the same number they have in the document. The MMRP describes the
actions that must take place to implement each mitigation measure.

Implementing Responsibility. This section indicates the entity responsible for their implementation of
the mitigation measures. It should be noted that the term ‘Project Sponsor’ is used collectively to refer to
SACOG and the PMT.

Monitoring Responsibility. This section indicated which entity will oversee implementation of the
measure, conduct actual monitoring and reporting, and take corrective actions when a measure has not
been properly implemented.

Timing. This section specifies the timing of implementation, including the point at which actions should
be complete.

Verification of Compliance. The MMRP will be used to track compliance and includes a section for
verification of compliance, including the date and name of those verifying compliance.
CHANGES TO MMRP

Minor changes to mitigation may occur as a result of permits and approvals by other agencies. Any substantive change in the MMRP shall be reported in writing. Modifications to the requirements of the MMRP may be made by SACOG subject to one of the following findings, documented by evidence included in the public record:

- The requirement included in the EA/IS/MND and the MMRP is no longer required because the significant environmental impact identified in the EA/IS/MND has been found not to exist, or to occur at a level which makes the impact less than significant as a result of changes in the project, changes in environment conditions, or other factors.

OR,

- The modified or substitute mitigation measure provides a level of environmental protection equal to, or greater than that afforded by the mitigation measure included in the EA/IS/MND and the MMRP; and,

- The modified or substitute mitigation measure or measures do not have significant adverse effects on the environment in addition to, or greater than those which were considered by the responsible hearing bodies in their decisions on the EA/IS/MND and the proposed project; and,

- The modified or substitute mitigation measures are feasible, and SACOG or, where applicable, other public agencies, through measures included in the MMRP or applicable regulations, can ensure implementation.

Findings and related documentation supporting the findings involving modifications to mitigation measures, including a determination whether further environmental review is required (see CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162-15164), shall be maintained in the project file with this MMRP and shall be made available to the public upon request.
## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Bio-1: Nesting Birds.</strong></td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Contractor shall submit reports of pre-construction nest surveys and daily monitoring events to responsible and/or trustee agencies, including the lead agency, USFWS, and CDFW.</td>
<td>If required for work initiated during nesting season, preconstruction surveys shall occur within 2 weeks prior to construction initiation during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31). For Swainson’s hawks, the schedule shall follow the protocol in Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee Guidelines, including preconstruction surveys during Period 1 (January 1 through March 20), Period 2 (March 20 through April 5), and Period 3 (April 5 through April 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid direct impacts to nesting birds during construction, including raptors such as Swainson’s hawk and migratory birds, the following impact avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented. Conduct site preparation, such as vegetation removal, and initiate construction, during the non-nesting season (generally September 1 through February 15). If work is initiated during the nesting season (generally February 15 through August 31), then a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey within 2 weeks prior to construction to determine if active nests occur in the project area or could be affected in the vicinity. If at any time during construction there is a delay of activities of at least 2 weeks during nesting season, then surveys shall be conducted again. The surveys must cover the construction area footprint, and out a distance of at least 250 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors. Surveys for Swainson’s hawk shall follow the methods described in the Swainson’s hawk Technical Advisory Committee Guidelines. If no active nests are identified, then no impacts would be expected, and no further measures are required. If active bird nests are identified, one or more of the following additional measures are required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction in the vicinity of the nest must be delayed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active, or has been abandoned, or young have fledged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If construction cannot be delayed, then a qualified biologist with stop work authority shall establish a non-disturbance buffer with either modified or no ground-disturbing work, and monitor the nest site to determine if nesting behavior is being disrupted. CDFW and USFWS shall be consulted to reach concurrence on the suitability of the non-disturbance buffer, considering line of site, distance, species, and type of activities proposed near the nest. If nesting behavior is disrupted, then work activities shall be redirected to other areas and/or modified in such a way that no further disruption is observed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, if needed, shall occur at least twice per week during construction until the nest is no longer active.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Bio-2: Bird nests on structures.</strong></td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 2 weeks prior to construction initiation during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallow nests and nests of other species, such as martins, that could be affected by construction shall be removed prior to new ground disturbance during the non-nesting season. Swallows are persistent, and continued monitoring and maintenance is required to ensure that nests that are initiated are removed. Nest removal is commonly accomplished mechanically with a jet of high pressure water, such as with a fire hose. As the birds attempt to build new nests, they shall be removed as needed, typically weekly or even daily, before they are completed. Alternatively, exclusion devices could be installed on structures to prevent new nests from being established during construction. Pre-emptive nest removal, prevention of new nesting, and ongoing monitoring and maintenance during nesting season, would avoid disruption of active nests on structures during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO 3: Roosting Bats.</strong></td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most suitable habitat for pallid bat in the study area is around and inside man-made structures. Preconstruction bat surveys would be conducted to inspect the undersides of the Tower Bridge and the Business Interstate 80 (I 80) overpass for roosting bats. A qualified biologist shall inspect structures and trees prior to removal or construction to determine if bats are roosting. If no roosting bats are found, no further mitigation would be necessary. If bats are present, the biologist shall direct the installation of one-way exclusion devices to allow bats to vacate the structure or tree prior to construction. Exclusionary devices, such as plastic sheeting, or plastic or wire mesh, can be used to allow bats to exit but not reenter any occupied roosts. Expanding foam and plywood sheets can be used to prevent bats from re-entering unoccupied roosts during construction. Exclusion devices shall be inspected, monitored, and maintained on structures during construction. Excluding bats from project trees and structures would avoid construction related impacts to this species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure BIO 4: Replace any removed tree per City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento requirements.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Contractor shall submit an arborist report and tree permit application to the City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento, describing each tree that could be affected by construction. The application would propose either replanting an appropriate quantity of new trees and/or payment of the appropriate in-lieu fee as specified under the ordinance.</td>
<td>Prior to construction initiation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CR-1: Pre-construction resource identification.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor will contract with the appropriate technical consultant and coordinate with project design to implement necessary research and field identification activities.</td>
<td>The Project Sponsor/Contractor shall provide evidence of compliance in the form of a technical memorandum, documenting research and field identification efforts.</td>
<td>Research and field verification activities shall take place during final design and prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time, there are no tree removals anticipated within the City of Sacramento. In West Sacramento, 15 recently planted London plane trees in the median of West Capitol Ave in front of West Sacramento City Hall will likely be removed. There is also one landmark-sized liquid amber tree in front of City Hall that also may be affected. Should trees need to be removed for construction, the Project sponsor will follow the applicable conditions of the City of Sacramento or City of West Sacramento requirements for replacing removed trees. The ordinances require a permit for tree removal or impacts to street trees, and, either replanting and maintaining replacement trees at an appropriate ratio specified by the cities under the ordinance, or, the payment of an in-lieu fee to the cities. The in-lieu fees fund the planting and maintaining of street trees in the cities, and therefore compensate each jurisdiction for in-kind replacement.

Additional identification efforts will consist of further archival research and subsurface exploration to avoid impacts to historic properties. As the Project design is advanced, additional archival research will be conducted to help identify specific locations in the APE where contributing elements of the RSHS District may exist. This research will target those areas of the design that coincide with known or likely below-grade hollow sidewalks or raised street structures. Preconstruction subsurface explorations will be conducted where construction is anticipated to approach the vertical limits of the APE in areas sensitive for cultural resources (both pre-historic and historic). The Project proponent will also coordinate with the City of Sacramento and property owners to obtain permission to access any remaining hollow sidewalk segments that are identified or suspected to exist in areas that could be affected by construction, particularly...
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Installation of OCS poles. If access is obtained and hollow sidewalks are present, the potentially affected hollow sidewalk segment(s) will be field recorded and the data collected will be added to the existing RSHS District Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 recordation forms (Downey, 2010), following the protocol described in the Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP) for the Project described below. This recordation will capture data about the hollow sidewalks/raised streets that are not readily available, and will improve access to information about these historic resources. If access cannot be obtained, the Project proponent will use ground-penetrating radar or other means to confirm the presence or absence of hollow sidewalk segments in the construction footprint. Should hollow sidewalks be identified in areas of potential OCS pole location, avoidance options will be executed. These options include modifying the proposed OCS pole locations, modifying track and system elements that are causing a conflict, modifying the pole foundation type, using a building attachment, or attaching span or pull-off wires to a backbone wire between two other poles or structures. The attachment of wires to adjacent buildings may require modification of the APE to accommodate those buildings, which would also necessitate re-consultation with the SHPO. No structures that are historic properties would be selected for wire attachment. Furthermore, if research or field investigation confirms the presence of historic or prehistoric archaeological resources that are eligible for the NRHP, and that would be in conflict with Project construction, the Project proponent will revisit the design to avoid adverse effects to historic properties.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor will contract with the appropriate technical consultants, including Native American monitors where necessary, to implement monitoring as specified.</td>
<td>The Contractor and field monitors shall maintain daily logs that demonstrate compliance with this measure.</td>
<td>During construction in all ground disturbance areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Monitoring.

All ground-disturbing activities in Downtown Sacramento will be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and, when appropriate (i.e., within 500 feet of known prehistoric sites), a Native American representative of any tribe that has been determined a consulting party to the Project. If any prehistoric or historic-era features, or human remains, are exposed during construction, work will stop or be redirected to allow for recordation, including photography, measurements, and Global Positioning System/Geological Information System (GPS/GIS) data. Field recordation data will be added to the existing P-34-2358/RSHS District DPR 523...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CR-3: Discovery.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor will contract with the appropriate technical consultants to prepare additional documentation should inadvertent discoveries occur.</td>
<td>The Project Sponsor/Contractor shall provide evidence of compliance in the form of a technical memorandum, documenting any inadvertent discoveries and corrective actions.</td>
<td>During construction in all ground disturbance areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadvertent discovery of cultural resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If cultural resources are encountered at a location beyond the Downtown Sacramento area, or in locations not identified by research or other investigations during the pre-construction period, work will stop or be redirected within 50 feet of the finds to allow for recordation, including photography, measurements, and GPS/GIS data in accordance with the UDP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadvertent discovery of hollow sidewalk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If hollow sidewalk features or raised street structures are encountered in locations not identified by research or other investigations during the pre-construction period, work will stop in order to allow recordation. The field recordation data collected (e.g., photography, field measurements, and GPS/GIS data) will be added to the existing RSHS District DPR 523 (Downey, 2010) recordation form. This recordation will follow the protocol for treating cultural resources identified as inadvertent discoveries described in the UDP for the Project. The UDP will describe treatment for both prehistoric and below-grade historic-era resources, including all elements that contribute to the RSHS District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadvertent discovery of human remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human burial. If human remains are encountered, work shall halt within 100 feet of the remains and, as required by law, the Sacramento or Yolo County Coroner should be notified immediately. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the NAHC within 24 hours of that determination. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code 5097.98, the NAHC, in turn, will immediately contact an individual who is most likely descended from the remains (aka: a Most Likely Descendent [MLD]). The MLD has 48 hours to inspect the site and recommend treatment of the remains. The landowner is obligated to work with the MLD in good faith to find a respectful resolution to the situation and entertain all reasonable options regarding the descendants’ preferences for treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementing Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CR-4: Prepare an Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP).</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor will contract with the appropriate technical consultants and coordinate with appropriate local agencies and utility providers to develop a feasible UDP that will ensure adequate protection of historic and prehistoric resources, including Native American remains, during construction.</td>
<td>Project Contractor(s) and archaeological field monitors will demonstrate compliance through daily logs and technical memoranda required for Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-4, above.</td>
<td>The UDP shall be prepared during the final design phase and prior to implementing construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An UDP will be developed prior to the initiation of construction. The UDP will provide detailed descriptions of protection and mitigation measures for archaeological resources in the APE. The UDP will include guidelines for avoidance of historic properties and establishment of environmentally sensitive areas; data recovery guidelines for those known historic properties/historical resources that cannot be avoided by Project design; protocols for treating cultural resources identified during preconstruction subsurface explorations, monitoring activities, and as inadvertent discoveries, including human remains; monitoring during construction; responsibilities and coordination with Native American tribes and individuals; and curation of recovered materials. The UDP will address treatment for both prehistoric resources, including human remains, and historic-era resources, including all elements that contribute to P-34-2358/RSHS District. All activities outlined in the UDP will be conducted under the direction of individuals who meet the professional qualification standards in Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guideline (Federal Register, Volume 48, No. 190, September 29, 1983).

As Project design progresses, all effort will be made to avoid known historic properties in the APE. Resources avoided by Project design will be identified as environmentally sensitive areas to ensure that these locations are not inadvertently encroached upon during construction. Newly identified cultural resources identified during preconstruction subsurface explorations, monitoring activities, and as inadvertent discoveries during construction will require testing to assess their research potential and eligibility for the listing in the NRHP and the CRHR. Archaeological testing will proceed with guidance from the National Park Service Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties (National Park Service, 2000). Evaluation efforts will involve archival research and archaeological fieldwork. Fieldwork methodologies will be tailored to the location, circumstance, and nature of the find. It therefore may be appropriate to use mechanical trenching techniques, controlled excavation units, or block exposures, shovel sampling explorations, or any combination of the above. All newly identified resources will be thoroughly mapped, photographed, located through Global Positioning System (GPS), and recorded on DPR 523 forms. If
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resources are found to be eligible to the NRHP or the CRHR, and they cannot be avoided by construction, data recovery will be required. Data recovery will conform to the principles in Parts I and II of Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1980), the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation” (Federal Register, Vol. 48, September 29, 1983, pp. 44716–44742), and appropriate SHPO guidelines. Data recovery may involve archaeological excavation, or for resources such as hollow sidewalks, detailed recordation on DPR 523 forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All construction will immediately cease within 100 feet in all directions of the discovery of human remains, which will then be treated in accordance with the requirements of Section 7050.5 of the California State Health and Human Safety Code. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the California NAHC, and the provisions of Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code will be followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All subsurface construction related to the Project will be monitored by a professional archaeologist, and as appropriate, by a Native American representative. Monitors will be responsible for working with construction personnel and identifying cultural resources that may be uncovered during ground disturbance. If cultural materials are unearthed, the monitor will have the authority to immediately halt work to allow the onsite archaeological monitor to inspect and assess the materials, determine whether additional analysis of the find is warranted, or whether construction can proceed without further analysis. Should additional analysis be required, testing protocols will be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA and the Project proponent will continually consult with Native American tribes about the treatment of resources of ancestral significance throughout Project development and construction. The UDP will define the responsibilities of the Native American tribes or individuals who are consulting parties to the Project. Native American monitors will have the opportunity to be present during testing and data recovery excavations on prehistoric and multicomponent sites, and during all construction activities in areas determined sensitive for the presence of subsurface prehistoric or ethnographic resources. It is recommended that Native American monitors meet the minimum qualifications in the guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provided by the NAHC (2012). Participating tribes will ultimately be responsible for identifying the individuals who will represent their tribe as monitors. The Native American monitors are expected to report to their tribal government or designee to keep them informed of Project activities. The Native American monitors and archaeological monitors will work together as a team to observe ground-disturbing activities. All cultural materials and associated records resulting from identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties conducted under the UDP shall be properly maintained in accordance with 36 CFR Part 79, and the provisions under 43 CFR Part 10 if the archaeological materials are determined to be of Native American origin, and the State of California's Guidelines for the Curation of Archeological Collections (State Historical Resources Commission, Department of Parks and Recreation, 1993). The Project proponent will consult with Native American tribes and individuals affiliated with the cultural materials on repatriation, as appropriate. If the Project proponent and consulting tribes cannot agree, the FTA will ensure that all cultural materials discovered on State lands are curated. Mitigation Measure CR-5: Train construction personnel on paleontological resources, and cease work in event of paleontological discovery. The Project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to carry out all actions related to paleontological resources. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, the qualified paleontologist shall train all construction personnel working on the Project. The training shall include an overview of potential paleontological resources that could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities to facilitate worker recognition, avoidance, and subsequent immediate notification to the qualified paleontologist for further evaluation and action, as appropriate. The training should also include an overview of penalties for unauthorized artifact collecting or intentional disturbance of paleontological resources. If any items of paleontological interest are discovered, the contractor shall be required to immediately suspend all work activities within 100 feet of the discovery site and immediately contact the lead agency. Work shall not be</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor shall contract with a professional paleontologist or geologist to provide training and provide technical support should important paleontological resources be discovered during construction. Project Contractor/field monitors shall demonstrate compliance through daily logs.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resumed until authorization is received from the lead agency and any recommendations received from a qualified paleontologist are implemented. Any accidental discovery of paleontological resources during construction shall be evaluated by the qualified paleontologist. If it is determined that the Project could damage a unique paleontological resource, as defined per the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2, and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall develop a treatment plan in consultation with the lead agency. The treatment plan shall be a site-specific plan in report format that shall:

1. Detail strategies for the management of the affected paleontological sites;
2. Include standards for further testing, sampling, documentation, data recovery, preservation and protection, analysis, and report preparation;
3. Outline an effective preservation plan or data recovery and documentation plan for those resources that the paleontologist has determined to have significant research or other value;
4. Provide a schedule for the implementation of the treatment plan; and
5. Provide a cost estimate for mitigation strategies, including testing, data recovery, curation, and report preparation.

**ENERGY AND PUBLIC UTILITIES**

**Mitigation Measure EPU-1: Utility Disruption.**

Design, construction, and inspection of required utility work would be completed in accordance with applicable statutes. Where feasible, utility relocations would be undertaken in advance of Project construction. SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with affected service providers to ensure that all utility work is performed in accordance with appropriate requirements and criteria. Coordination with the utility providers would be initiated during the preliminary engineering phase of the Project and would continue through final design and construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementing Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumed until authorization is received from the lead agency and any recommendations received from a qualified paleontologist are implemented. Any accidental discovery of paleontological resources during construction shall be evaluated by the qualified paleontologist. If it is determined that the Project could damage a unique paleontological resource, as defined per the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2, and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines. If avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall develop a treatment plan in consultation with the lead agency. The treatment plan shall be a site-specific plan in report format that shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The treatment plan shall be a site-specific plan in report format that shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Detail strategies for the management of the affected paleontological sites;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include standards for further testing, sampling, documentation, data recovery, preservation and protection, analysis, and report preparation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outline an effective preservation plan or data recovery and documentation plan for those resources that the paleontologist has determined to have significant research or other value;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide a schedule for the implementation of the treatment plan; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide a cost estimate for mitigation strategies, including testing, data recovery, curation, and report preparation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY AND PUBLIC UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Sponsor shall coordinate with utility providers and review plans and specifications for compliance. Project Contractor will continue coordination with</td>
<td>During final design, and prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordination efforts would include planning for utility re-routes, identification of any other potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies for overcoming problems that may arise to ensure minimum disruption of utility service or operation during the utility work and Project construction.

If unexpected underground utilities are encountered, the construction contractor would coordinate with the utility provider to develop plans to address the utility conflict, protect the utility if needed, and limit service interruptions. Any short-term, limited service interruptions of known utilities would be scheduled well in advance, and appropriate notification would be provided to users.

SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with all utility providers during the design phase of the Project to incorporate effective design treatments and construction procedures to avoid adverse impacts to existing utilities and traffic during construction. Nonetheless, the potential exists for construction activities to encounter unexpected utilities. In addition, utility relocations may require short-term, limited interruptions of service. No interference to existing utility services is anticipated during the realignment of the overhead power transmission lines, because PG&E and SMUD would put customer loads on alternate lines until the connections are re-established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination efforts would include planning for utility re-routes, identification of any other potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies for overcoming problems that may arise to ensure minimum disruption of utility service or operation during the utility work and Project construction. If unexpected underground utilities are encountered, the construction contractor would coordinate with the utility provider to develop plans to address the utility conflict, protect the utility if needed, and limit service interruptions. Any short-term, limited service interruptions of known utilities would be scheduled well in advance, and appropriate notification would be provided to users. SACOG and/or RT would coordinate with all utility providers during the design phase of the Project to incorporate effective design treatments and construction procedures to avoid adverse impacts to existing utilities and traffic during construction. Nonetheless, the potential exists for construction activities to encounter unexpected utilities. In addition, utility relocations may require short-term, limited interruptions of service. No interference to existing utility services is anticipated during the realignment of the overhead power transmission lines, because PG&amp;E and SMUD would put customer loads on alternate lines until the connections are re-established.</td>
<td>utility providers and document compliance during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure HZ 1:—Site Investigation.</strong>&lt;br&gt;To mitigate the potential for encountering unknown contaminated soil and/or groundwater in the Project area, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be conducted along the proposed alignment and MSFs in areas where excavation or subsurface disturbance will take place close to sites with listed known soil or groundwater contamination. The Phase I investigation will be done during the design phase and completed prior to the completion of final design. The purpose of the Phase I investigation will be to determine whether suspected contamination, as listed in the records search, is actually present on the property, and if additional site characterization is necessary prior to implementation of the Project to protect the public and environment from harm. The Phase I investigation may include activities such as geophysical surveys, drilling, trenching, soil sampling, soil gas sampling, ground water sampling, and surface water sampling. If the Phase I investigation finds that additional site characterization is necessary prior to implementation of the Project to protect the public and environment from harm, then a Phase II investigation shall be required for areas where soil and/or groundwater contamination are suspected. The Phase II investigation will be conducted to determine the nature and extent of contamination. If the Phase II investigation concludes there is a potential to encounter contaminated materials (during and post-construction), then a soil and groundwater management plan shall be developed and implemented. The soil and groundwater management plan shall provide detailed procedures to be followed in the event that contaminated materials are encountered (during and post-construction).&lt;br&gt;The information generated from implementation of the site investigation would be integrated into the operational design of the Project, and would limit the potential for adverse effects attributable to development on previously contaminated land.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor will contract with the appropriate specialists to conduct the Phase I ESA.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor shall review Phase I ESA to determine whether Phase II study and additional groundwater management plan is required. If so, the Project Sponsor and Contractor shall conduct additional studies and monitor compliance during construction, as necessary. Documentation may be in the form of daily logs and/or specialized reports.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOISE AND VIBRATION

| Mitigation Measure NV-1: Implement Wheel Noise Control Measures. | Project Sponsor/Contractor | Project Sponsor shall work with design team to develop noise control measures | During final design phase and prior to construction. |
| Resilient wheels or suitable equivalent noise control measures shall be implemented that achieves a reduction of wheel squeal to Moderate or No Impact | | | |
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure IV-2: Substation Design.</strong></td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Sponsor shall work with design team to develop noise control measures and Contractor shall monitor implementation.</td>
<td>During final design phase, construction and operation.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring may be necessary by the Project Sponsor during operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To alleviate noise impacts from substation operation, noise impacts from substation operation will be mitigated in one of the following ways:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locate traction power substations at a distance farther from noise-sensitive receptors than the screening distance determined in this analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-evaluate the inside buffer during engineering design, and if necessary, install efficient enclosures to meet local noise threshold criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place traction power substations in underground utility vaults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mitigation Measure IV-3: MSF Facilities.

To avoid noise impacts from the MSF facilities in West Sacramento:

- Install sound walls around the MSF in West Sacramento. A perimeter wall that is 6 to 8 feet high would minimize noise from the MSF at this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure IV-4: Vibration Control.</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid vibration-related impacts from streetcar operations:</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Sponsor shall work with design team to develop vibration minimization measures and Contractor shall monitor implementation.</td>
<td>During final design phase, construction and operation.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring may be necessary by the Project Sponsor during operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional measurements, including soil vibration propagation testing, shall be made during the engineering design phase to evaluate the potential for efficient soil propagation at distances beyond 50 feet, site-specific vibration propagation, and the effects on vibration transmission into those buildings identified as being impacted in the current analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If streetcar operational speeds are 30 to 35 mph, then various forms of vibration control will need to be investigated during the engineering phase of the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are different measures available depending on the level of vibration reduction required. For the highest level of reduction indicated for the Project (e.g., 13 VdB), a floating slab track may be implemented. Where lower levels of vibration reduction are required (e.g., 5 VdB or less), it may be possible to use a resilient ballast mat if the track design permits this approach, similar to that implemented at SFMTA. At special trackwork (i.e., crossover), it should be possible to implement “flange-bearing frogs,” as has been accomplished elsewhere (e.g., SFMTA). The majority of vibration impacts due to streetcar operations would be eliminated if the streetcar speeds were reduced to 20 mph or less. In the City of Sacramento, the remaining vibration impacts at 20 mph or less would occur at the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament and the Cathedral Building Apartments where a crossover is to be located. As with the case where speeds are 30 to 35 mph, a flange-bearing frog would control vibration from such special trackwork. Assuming mitigation of flange bearing frog is implemented, then for the remaining receptors impacted at a vehicle speed of 20 mph the vibration level would be reduced if operating speeds were lower. The predicted level for 20 mph with flange bearing frog are 1 dB over criterion. Speed reduction would be minimal (e.g., 18 mph instead of 20mph).</td>
<td>Sponsor during operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure NV-5: Noise-Limiting Construction Practices.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Sponsor will ensure the measures identified in NV-5 are included in bid package and plan specs. Contractor will demonstrate compliance in daily logs.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control the potential impacts to the nearby community during construction of the Project, the following array of mitigation strategies would be employed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locate noisy equipment as far as possible from noise-sensitive receptors. In addition, temporary barriers should be employed around the equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use temporary noise barriers along the Project right-of-way. Barriers/curtains must achieve a Sound Transmission Class of 30 or greater in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTM) Test Method E90, and be constructed from material having a surface density of at least 2 pounds per square foot to ensure adequate transmission loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use sound absorption for temporary barriers in the area of Downtown Sacramento. In this area, a reverberant environment is produced due to the narrow distance between buildings and hard pavement surfaces. Line the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner face of the temporary barrier or use a curtain with an absorptive face. The absorptive liner or absorptive face should have a Noise Reduction Coefficient rating of 0.70 or greater, in accordance to ASTM Test Method C423.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Require ambient-sensitive (&quot;smart&quot;) backup alarms, SAE Class D, or limit to SAE Class C (97 dB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Fit silencers to combustion engines. Ensure that equipment has quality mufflers installed, in good working condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Switch off engines or reduce to idle when not in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Lubricate and maintain equipment regularly. Equipment is normally quieter when well maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related truck traffic should be re-routed along roadways that would produce the least disturbance to sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure NV-6: Vibration Monitoring. To avoid vibration-induced annoyance impacts due to construction activities, the activities should be kept below the FTA impact criteria for each land use category. Equipment and methods selected by the contractor to reduce the potential for annoyance will be reviewed and approved by the Project proponent. Possible mitigation strategies that will be implemented to ensure vibration-induced annoyance does not exceed the impact criteria include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Avoid the use of pavement breakers. Instead, use a hoe ram with hydraulic chisel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Avoid the use of dynamic compaction at a distance closer than 25 feet from any sensitive receptors, or use alternative methods of compaction in areas of construction that would be closer than 25 feet from sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Monitor vibration during construction to ensure compliance with criteria for building damage for buildings within 40 feet of construction activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a preconstruction crack survey of these buildings.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor/Contractor</td>
<td>Project Sponsor will coordinate with appropriate local agencies/neighborhood representatives and include requirements for bicycle detours are specified in bid package and plans. Contractor will demonstrate compliance in daily logs.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan routes for hauling material out of the Project site that would cause the least impact (annoyance). Propose truck routes along roads where the sensitive receptors are at least 75 feet from the street centerline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Implement temporary bicycle detours during construction.**

Bicycle detours will be devised and publicized in advance of streetcar construction. Alternatively, it may be possible to route bicycles along short sidewalk segments, depending on the pedestrian volumes along the sidewalk.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Develop Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan.**

The Project sponsor will develop a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan that will be subject to review and approval by the City of West Sacramento Traffic Engineer, the City of Sacramento Department of Transportation, Caltrans, and local emergency service providers, including the fire and police departments. The plan will ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained during construction. At a minimum, the plan will include:

- The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures;
- Time of day of arrival and departure of trucks;
- Limitations on the size and type of trucks, provision of a staging area with a
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementing Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (Name and Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of a truck circulation pattern;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of driveway access plan so that safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movements are maintained (e.g., steel plates, minimum distances of open trenches, and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manual traffic control when necessary;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provisions for pedestrian safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A copy of the construction traffic management plan will be submitted to local emergency response agencies, and these agencies will be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct roadways.

**Mitigation TRA-3: Coordinate construction activities with the U.S. Coast Guard.**

If construction activities limit or impede use of the lift mechanism of the Tower Bridge during intermittent or extended periods, the U.S. Coast Guard will be informed of these occurrences a minimum of 30 days in advance of the interruption to navigational traffic. The U.S. Coast Guard will post notice of the temporary closure in the Federal Register, and businesses and boat owners that would be most affected by the obstruction of navigation will be notified individually. The Project sponsor will coordinate with Caltrans, the owner of the Tower Bridge, the U.S. Coast Guard, and affected businesses/boat owners to minimize or alleviate the potential impact by providing proper notification of the bridge closures; by scheduling closures in the non-peak excursion season (October through April); or by raising the bridge for an extended time to allow continuous river navigation, while temporarily rerouting vehicular and non-motorized traffic.

Project Sponsor and Contractor, in coordination with USCG, Caltrans and affected businesses/boat owners  
Contractor will demonstrate compliance in daily logs or other specialized report(s).  
Prior to and during construction.
WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the project manager and lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project; and

WHEREAS, SACOG staff, in coordination with the Project Management Team for the Project and a consultant team, has prepared an Initial Study and a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Project analyzed under the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration consists of the development of a 3.3-mile streetcar alignment extending from the West Sacramento Civic Center to the Midtown entertainment and retail district in Sacramento, serving mixed-use neighborhoods in the Washington Neighborhood and the Railyards Specific Plan area that have been planned around a high-quality transit system intended to serve these new and emerging employment and residential districts, and connecting key destinations in these neighborhoods, including: Raley Field; Old Sacramento; the Sacramento Valley Station in the Railyards Specific Plan area; Downtown Plaza Mall; the historic Memorial Auditorium; the Sacramento Community Center Theater; the California State Capitol building; the Sacramento Entertainment and Sports Center (ESC); and the Sacramento Convention Center; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration concludes that implementation of the Project could result in a number of significant effects on the environment and identified mitigation measures that would reduce the significant effects to a less-than-significant level; and

WHEREAS, CEQA requires the decision-making body of the lead agency to incorporate feasible mitigation measures that would reduce those significant environment effects to a less-than-significant level; and

WHEREAS, CEQA also requires a lead agency to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Board of Directors has delegated decision-making authority to adopt this Resolution to the Transportation Committee; and
WHEREAS, the Transportation Committee has reviewed and considered the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and related Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project and intends to take actions on the Project in compliance with CEQA and state and local guidelines implementing CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project are, by this reference, incorporated into this Resolution as if fully set forth herein.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE OF SACOG AS FOLLOWS:

THAT THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE does hereby make the following findings: (1) it has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and other information in the record and has considered the information contained therein, prior to acting upon or approving the Project, (2) it has independently considered the comments on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the responses thereto, (3) the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Project has been completed in compliance with CEQA and consistent with state and local guidelines implementing CEQA, and (4) the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration represents the independent judgment and analysis of SACOG as lead agency for the Project; and

THAT THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE does hereby adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the Project. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are: (1) on file at Sacramento Council of Governments, 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 and (2) available for inspection by any interested person; and

THAT THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, having made the foregoing findings and adopted the foregoing documents, does hereby approve the release of bid documents for final design and vehicle procurement for Project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 6th day of August 2015, by the following vote of the Transportation Committee Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

___________________________________  _____________________________________
David Sander                                Mike McKeever
Chair                                         Chief Executive Officer