

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This environmental impact report (EIR) evaluates the impacts of the *Draft City of Citrus Heights General Plan* (Draft General Plan) and *Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan* (GGRP).

This EIR contains comments and responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, which was circulated for public review from March 8, 2011 through April 22, 2011 in Chapter 7.0, “Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR”. Revisions and clarifications to the EIR made in response to comments are indicated by ~~strikeout~~ and underline text, as illustrated in this paragraph.

The Draft General Plan represents an update to the current General Plan, originally prepared in 2000. This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21000-21178.1), the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 1500-15387), and relevant court decisions.

As stated in Section 15123(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” This executive summary includes:

1. a summary description of the proposed project;
2. a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (see Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter);
3. identification of the alternatives evaluated; and
4. a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the Draft General Plan.

1.2 TYPE OF EIR

This EIR is a program EIR, as described under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. [14 CCR 15000 et seq.]). According to the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[a]), a state or local agency should prepare a program EIR, rather than a project EIR, when the lead agency proposes the following:

- ▶ a series of related actions that are linked geographically;
- ▶ logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program; or
- ▶ individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

A program EIR “may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related...in connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[a][3]). In this case, the program EIR will address the Draft General Plan and GGRP, which is the proposed “project,” as defined by CEQA. This program EIR considers a series of actions related to adoption and implementation of the Draft General Plan and GGRP.

As a program EIR, this document focuses on the overall effect of the Draft General Plan and GGRP. The analyses in this EIR do not examine the effects of site-specific projects that may occur within the overall umbrella of this program in the future. The nature of general plans is such that many proposed policies are intended to be general, with details to be worked out during implementation. As a result, many of the impacts and mitigation measures in this EIR can be described only in general or qualitative terms. This EIR does, however, quantify impacts related to transportation, air quality, noise, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and other topics, making reasonable assumptions as to the amount, type, and character of future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

An EIR must provide a statement of project objectives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15124). This statement of objectives is used to guide the environmental impact analysis and to evaluate alternatives to the proposed project. The project proposes to update the City's existing General Plan elements and prepare a new GGRP that will implement the Draft General Plan. The overarching purpose of the updated plan is to provide a policy framework for improved mobility, complete streets, sustainable development, water quality and conservation and flood hazard management in the City of Citrus Heights and its planning area. The GGRP is an implementing action of the Draft General Plan, which will locally help meet statewide obligations to comply with Assembly Bill (AB) 32.

The Draft General Plan Vision Statement and Planning Principles are expressions of the public's broad, long-range view of the desired future for their community. The Vision Statement represents the public's expectations for themselves and future generations, with a focus on key issues that for which there is consensus in the community. The Planning Principles present shared community values. These values guided the policy development in the Draft General Plan. Together, the Vision Statement and Planning Principles comprise the project objectives for this EIR.

1.4 VISION STATEMENT

Citrus Heights is a highly livable place that:

- ▶ Is safe because of excellent public services and controlled traffic;
- ▶ Has a strong sense of identity, character and pride;
- ▶ Offers ample business and job opportunities in attractive commercial areas; and
- ▶ Is supported by a strong and fiscally responsible City government.

1.5 PLANNING PRINCIPLES

- ▶ **Land Use** - Neighborhoods with high vacancies, poor maintenance and potential for crime should be targeted for improvements under a variety of programs and strategies. Future planning should continue to provide for a range of housing opportunities, without high-density projects dominating any neighborhood.
- ▶ **Economic Development** - Citrus Heights does not have the property tax base common in other cities and relies heavily on sales tax revenues. The City should pursue a strong economic development program that supports existing businesses and attracts new ones. Economic development and redevelopment strategies should target commercial corridors with vacant buildings and lots, inappropriate signage and poor property maintenance. The City should consider expanding its boundaries to include land suitable for job-creating uses such as offices and light industry.
- ▶ **Circulation-Mobility** - ~~Ever~~ Increasing traffic, much of it from outside the City, will exacerbate congestion on the City's major roadways and also result in cut-through travel through residential neighborhoods, higher vehicle speeds and increased noise levels. Solutions could include street improvements, fixed-route transit (i.e., connecting key commercial districts), and improved bicycle and pedestrian routes. Where appropriate, streets should be completed and connected. In the past, roadways were viewed primarily for automobile

travel. This viewpoint has evolved to one where roads are seen within a complete streets context, where the needs of all mobility types, users, and ability levels are equally important.

- ▶ **Natural Resources** - Creek corridors provide opportunities for new biking and walking trails for recreation and transportation, provided that private property rights are respected and safety and maintenance concerns are addressed. Natural habitat areas should be preserved, including creek corridors and oak woodlands. The City should plant and preserve trees where possible, and require trees and landscaping in new development. The City should promote a low-impact development approach to balance the needs of land development and stormwater management.
- ▶ **Historic Resources** - Though many historic landmarks are gone, the community can retain its sense of place by using historic names, installing plaques, preserving trees and other natural features, restoring and reusing noteworthy buildings, and creating a museum or other historic resource center. Development should respect and consider historic and archaeological resources, as well as the creeks and oak woodlands that originally attracted native peoples to the area.
- ▶ **Cultural Resources** - The City should support school district efforts to provide quality teaching, facilities and activities, and recreation and park district efforts to provide opportunities for residents to enjoy parks and participate in a wide range of sports, education and recreation programs. The community needs more and prominent social and civic gathering places. The City should promote activities such as farmers’ markets, outdoor fairs, concerts, organized public art displays and private art and performance venues. The City should improve community gateways with landscaping, signage, trees and art.
- ▶ **Public Services** - The City should forge strong partnerships to provide high quality services to Citrus Heights residents. The City also should require new developments or annexations to pay their fair share toward maintaining current levels of service. Residents should be afforded all opportunities to participate in governance.
- ▶ **Sustainability** – The City should promote efforts to improve communitywide sustainability. Building design and construction should include energy conservation techniques that minimize energy consumption, aimed at a transition to clean, renewable energy sources. The City should implement measures to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

1.6 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Draft General Plan is the City’s overarching policy and planning document. The Draft General Plan indicates Citrus Heights’ long-range objectives for physical development and conservation within the planning area. The General Plan provides decision makers, City staff, property owners, interested property developers and builders, and the public-at-large with the City’s policy direction for managing future development and conservation. The Draft General Plan is comprehensive in scope, addressing land use, transportation, housing, conservation of resources, economic development, public facilities and infrastructure, public safety, and open space, among many other subjects.

1.7 TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THE DRAFT GENERAL PLAN

California planning law requires cities and counties to prepare and adopt a “comprehensive, long-range general plan” to guide development (Government Code Section 65300). In order to successfully guide long-range development, the General Plan requires a complex set of analysis, comprehensive public outreach and input, and public policy for a vast range of topic areas. The General Plan has several basic functions, including (1) establishing and documenting the community’s vision for the future; (2) decision making guide; and (3) meeting state legal requirements.

State law specifies the content of general plans. Current law requires seven mandated elements:

- ▶ Land Use,
- ▶ Circulation,
- ▶ Housing,
- ▶ Conservation,
- ▶ Open Space,
- ▶ Noise, and
- ▶ Safety.

The Draft General Plan Update is organized into three elements: Community Development, Resource Conservation and Community Health. Within these three elements are the seven required general plan elements as specified by state law (Government Code Section 65302) – the Community Development element addresses Land Use, Housing and Circulation; the Resource Conservation element includes Conservation and Open Space; and the Community Health element covers Safety and Noise, as well as other Conservation topics (e.g., air quality and soils). The City has chosen to group topics differently than provided by state law, which is permitted by the California Government Code. The following is a brief description of each element’s contents and policy direction.

1.7.1 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

The land use component of this element serves as the backbone of the Draft General Plan. The character of Citrus Heights is strongly influenced by how it has developed and transitioned over time to accommodate new land uses. At the same time, this element of the General Plan focuses on the City’s neighborhoods, commercial areas, corridors, Sunrise MarketPlace, gateways, public spaces, housing, economic development and circulation. It is comprehensive in its structure, striving for attractive and orderly physical form and appearance of the community.

Determining the future location, type, and intensity of new development and infill projects, and establishing the desired mix and relationship between such projects are key objectives of this element. The Draft General Plan establishes land use designations to identify the types and nature of development permitted, providing a mix of land uses, a suitable inventory of housing for a range of income groups, a robust commercial and employment base, sufficient open space and recreational opportunities, and adequate public facilities and services.

The policies in this element are intended to preserve the unique character of the City and create a distinctive community identity, while preserving the features of areas that are still rural in character amidst the edge of a highly urbanized city. It seeks to maintain safe and high-quality neighborhoods through the City’s neighborhood associations and local investment. Another major area of focus of this element is a policy direction that forms partnerships with the private sector, seeking to maintain and enhance the quality of its businesses and retain a healthy employment sector. Business activity makes up a significant part of the City’s fabric and generates substantial revenue to help keep the City healthy. Tying these together is the City’s plan to design, construct, and manage a Complete Streets transportation network that accommodates the needs of all mobility types, users, and ability levels.

1.7.2 RESOURCE CONSERVATION

The Resource Conservation element of the Draft General Plan addresses biological resources, open space, energy conservation and cultural resources. Its focus is on the protection and enhancement of these limited resources.

Draft General Plan policies extend beyond just the natural environment. They focus on the residents who enjoy life within the context of the City’s rich social and architectural history. Promoting appreciation and awareness of Citrus Heights’ history, coupled with the Plan’s efforts to encourage public involvement in City decision-making processes, is a key to the success of a thriving City and ensuring an example is set for the City’s youth – the future leaders of the community.

1.7.3 COMMUNITY HEALTH

The Community Health element of the Draft General Plan addresses community health issues, including flood protection, seismic activity, hazardous materials emergencies, air quality, GHGs, and noise. This element's policies and programs are designed to maintain a healthy and safe physical environment and to ensure community health is sustained through access to high-quality public services.

Policies and programs contained within this element include using Best Management Practices to improve the health of the watershed and minimize flooding in and around the City, reducing the potential for hazardous materials accidents or spills, and protecting residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.

1.7.4 DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY ASSUMPTIONS

Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan update would result in increased population, housing units, and commercial and industrial floor area within the planning area.

The development capacity estimates included in the General Plan update and incorporated in this EIR are not population and employment projections or estimates. They are not forecasts of future development activity. These assumptions are a conservative estimate of the total development capacity within the planning area if all parcels were fully developed consistent with the Draft General Plan. Under these assumptions, implementation of the Draft General Plan could accommodate a total population of 100,480 people, 3,557 new housing units, and the addition of up to 2.95 million non-residential square feet of commercial and industrial development.

1.8 ALTERNATIVES

The State CEQA Guidelines require that EIRs contain a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Section 15126.6(c) of the Guidelines directs lead agencies that the "range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects." Based on this guidance, the EIR evaluates alternatives that would lessen or avoid significant project impacts that have been identified in Chapter 4. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.

Chapter 5 of this EIR, "Alternatives," provides a comparative analysis between the General Plan update and two alternatives. One of these alternatives, as required under CEQA, is a no project alternative (buildout of the 2000 General Plan). Alternatives analyzed include:

- ▶ **Alternative 1. No Project/Existing General Plan.** The No Project Alternative assumes that the Draft General Plan would not be implemented, and that the City would continue to build out as indicated in the existing (2000) General Plan. Unlike most general plan amendment projects, the Draft General Plan does not increase residential density or the intensity of permitted commercial or industrial uses. Rather, the land uses assumed within the No Project Alternative and the Draft General Plan are the same. Both would allow for approximately 3,577 additional dwelling units and approximately 3 million non-residential square feet of additional non-residential development. Under the No Project Alternative, Sunrise Boulevard would be widened to a six-lane arterial between Greenback Lane and the north City limit, as identified in the current General Plan. The new sustainability, energy efficiency, climate change, complete streets, traffic level of service, and water quality/flooding policies would not be adopted by the City, and the City would not adopt the proposed Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (GGRP) under this alternative.

- ▶ **Alternative 2. Reduced Density/Intensity.** This alternative assumes the same land use designations as the Draft General Plan, but assumes that development would occur at a density lower than what was assumed for the proposed project based on existing development densities and intensities. That is, where the project would include, for example, commercial development in the Commercial designation at a floor-area ratio (FAR) of 0.6, this alternative would assume development in the Commercial designation at a FAR of 0.3. Similarly, where the project would include multi-family, high-density residential development at 21-30 units per acre, this alternative would assume medium-density residential development at 11-15 units per acre.

1.8.1 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the alternatives to the General Plan update, CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative among the alternatives considered be selected and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest of least severe adverse impacts. If the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e]).

For the purposes of this EIR, Alternative 2 is considered environmentally superior. The Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would generally have similar levels of impact for most environmental issues identified for the proposed project; however, it would have less impact with regard to transportation and mobility and air quality. Although the alternative would provide only a minor potential reduction in impacts to these environmental issues, it would be the environmentally superior alternative.

1.8.2 ALTERNATIVES AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Overall, the Draft General Plan and this EIR provide a substantial framework for avoiding and mitigating significant environmental effects of future development. The density and intensity of future land uses in the High Density Residential designation and the permitted commercial FAR are important elements in the City’s efforts to revitalize mixed-use commercial and multi-family residential areas. The Draft General Plan Planning Principles, listed in Chapter 3, “Project Description”, state: “Citrus Heights does not have the property tax base common in other cities and relies heavily on sales tax revenues. The City should pursue a strong economic development program that supports existing businesses and attracts new ones. Economic development and redevelopment strategies should target commercial corridors with vacant buildings and lots, inappropriate signage and poor property maintenance.” Maximizing the potential of the City’s High Density Residential and General Commercial land use designations is important to the City’s overall economic development strategy and reducing the economic value of properties with these designations would hinder economic growth. Therefore, the City does not support Alternative 2 as adequately meeting the Planning Principles expressed within the Draft General Plan and therefore the project objectives identified in this EIR.

1.9 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Chapter 4 of this EIR evaluates in detail the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the Draft General Plan and GGRP and sets forth mitigation measures (and mitigating policies, measures, and actions of the Draft General Plan and GGRP) that would avoid or reduce environmental impacts.

Chapter 6 evaluates potential cumulative impacts associated with the Draft General Plan and GGRP. Table 2-1 (at the end of this chapter) lists each of the environmental impacts of the Draft General Plan and GGRP, then presents the level of significance of each impact before mitigation, mitigation measures for significant and potentially significant impacts, and the level of significance of each impact after mitigation. It also lists the significant cumulative effects provided in Chapter 6 of this EIR.

1.9.1 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS REQUIRED

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a summary of an EIR identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the Notice of Preparation, comment letters were received regarding the Draft General Plan and GGRP.

In general, areas of potential controversy known to the City include GHG emissions, traffic congestion, air quality impacts from the Roseville Railyard, and intensification of underutilized properties. These issues were considered in the preparation of this EIR, and, where appropriate, are addressed in the environmental impact analyses presented in Chapter 4.

Further actions or procedures required to allow implementation of the Draft General Plan and GGRP would include revisions to the City Zoning Code, tentative maps, site plans, building permits, grading permits, sphere of influence expansions, annexations, and other actions. Future development project proposals, public investments, and other actions, would also be subject to CEQA requirements.

Various other federal, state, and local plans and other laws will affect future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan and GGRP. In some cases, compliance with these plans and/or laws will provide additional reduction of the impacts of future land uses and development. In other cases, these plans and/or laws may preempt City jurisdiction, resulting in environmental impacts that may not occur in their absence. This EIR identifies applicable laws, plans, regulations, and policies of other agencies that would have bearing on the implementation of the Draft General Plan and GGRP, where related to environmental issues.

1.9.2 AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT EIR FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT

Copies of the Draft General Plan and ~~this~~ the Draft EIR ~~are~~ were available through the City of Citrus Heights Community & Economic Development Department, Planning Division. The City ~~will~~ circulated the document to public agencies, other public and private organizations, property owners, developers, and other interested individuals. Information on the General Plan and EIR is also available on the City's web site (<http://www.citrusheights.net>).

~~Comments on the Draft EIR may be submitted in writing or via email to the Planning Division:~~

~~City of Citrus Heights Planning Division
Attn: Colleen McDuffee
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621
E-mail to: cmcduffee@citrusheights.net~~

~~To keep the document succinct and useful as a decision-making tool, the State CEQA Guidelines charge that an EIR focus on a project's significant environmental impacts and not address every imaginable less-than-significant effect. Comments should be focused on the adequacy and completeness of the Draft EIR, or should address questions about the environmental consequences of project implementation. In this case, "adequacy" is defined as the thoroughness of the EIR in addressing significant environmental effects, identifying mitigation measures for those impacts, and supplying enough information for public officials to make decisions about the merits of the project.~~

1.9.3 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS AND FINAL EIR

~~After the close of the public review period,~~ a This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) ~~will be prepared,~~ contains the comments received by the City during the public review period and responses to those comments. This document will be made available to public agencies and the general public so those parties can review the Final EIR before the City certifies it as complete.

This page intentionally left blank.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.1 Land Use, Population & Housing			
4.1-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in additional housing units, commercial and industrial development, and an increase in population. However, the planning area is 98% built out, and little vacant land remains for development. Additionally, compliance with policies and actions in the Draft General Plan would ensure an orderly and managed land use pattern. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.1-2: Displace a Substantial Numbers of People or Existing Housing. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would not result in displacement of substantial numbers of people or existing housing units; therefore it would not necessitate the construction of housing units elsewhere. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.1-3: Physically Divide an Established Community. Compliance with policies and actions in the Draft General Plan would ensure that future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan result in development patterns that are compatible with adjacent development and would not physically divide an established community. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.1-4: Conflict with Other Plans. Policies and actions in the Draft General Plan would not conflict with other applicable land use plans, policies, or agency regulation with jurisdiction over the project. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.2 Transportation			
4.2-1: Increase in Travel Demand. The City anticipates an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) with implementation of the Draft General Plan compared to existing conditions. An increase in travel demand is not in itself an adverse physical environmental impact, but rather causes a variety of impacts. The full range of impacts related to travel demand is analyzed and reported throughout the environmental topic sections of this EIR. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact
 LTS = Less than Significant
 S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.2-2: Reduced Capacity of the Transportation System. Increased travel demand within the planning area, in combination with regional growth, would add traffic to roadways which experience congestion under existing conditions, and which would be congested in future years. Implementation of the Draft General Plan will also require new transportation funding mechanisms or programs that are not yet in place. The lack of sufficient funding could limit the City's ability to expand the existing transportation network and to comply with the Draft General Plan transportation policies in a timely manner. This impact is considered significant.	S	No mitigation measures are available beyond policies, measures, and actions in the Draft General Plan and GGRP.	SU
4.2-3: Emergency Access. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would degrade LOS from current conditions on roadways used for emergency vehicle access, which could adversely affect access. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.2-4: Conflicts with Adopted Plans and Policies for Non-Motorized Modes of Transportation and Public Transit. Implementation of the Draft General Plan and GGRP would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting non-motorized modes of transportation and public transit. Rather, implementation of these plans would expand opportunities for use of non-motorized modes. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1: Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Emission of Criteria Air Pollutants and precursors during construction of future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds of 85 lb/day for NO _x . Policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan would support compliance with SMAQMD-recommended standard construction mitigation practices. This would substantially reduce construction-generated air pollutant emissions. However, due to the amount of total development that could potentially occur consistent with the Draft General Plan, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors is considered substantial, and could violate an ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or predicted	S	4.3-1: Require Implementation of SMAQMD <i>Basic Construction Emission Control Practices</i> . Where needed to reduce potentially significant impacts, the City shall require project applicants, as a condition of project approval, to incorporate the most current basic control measures recommended by SMAQMD to reduce fugitive PM10 dust emissions, where required. These practices (as of February 2011) are described at the following location: http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/cequguideupdate/Ch3BasicConstructionEmissionControlPracticesFINAL.pdf	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this impact is considered significant.		<p>4.3-2: Require Compliance with SMAQMD PM Screening Criteria and Implementation of SMAQMD <i>Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices</i>. For projects with a maximum daily disturbed area (i.e., grading, excavation, cut and fill) greater than 15 acres, project applicants, as a condition of project approval, shall perform screening level analysis of PM10 emissions during construction, and shall perform dispersion modeling if screening level analysis indicates that concentration-based limits may be exceeded (less than 50 µg/m³ 24-hour standard; 20 µg/m³ Annual Arithmetic Mean for PM10; and less than 12 µg/m³ Annual Arithmetic Mean for PM2.5 for the maximally exposed individual sensitive receptor). If dispersion modeling indicates that these limits may be exceeded, and where needed to reduce potentially significant impacts, project applicants shall incorporate the most current enhanced fugitive PM dust control practices recommended by SMAQMD. These practices (as of February 2011) are described at the following location:</p> <p>http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/cequguideupdate/Ch3EnhancedFugitivePMDustControlPracticesFINAL.pdf</p>	
<p>4.3-2: Consistency with Air Quality Planning Efforts. Draft General Plan policies and actions would not conflict with the Ozone Attainment Plan or Regional Transportation Plan, policies, or agency regulation with jurisdiction over the project. However, future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and ozone precursors, both of which affect regional air quality. The Draft General Plan would result in fewer emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors per capita than under the current General Plan, and would accommodate growth in a more emissions-efficient manner. However, anticipated population and development consistent with the Draft General Plan could lead to operational (mobile-source and area-source) emissions that would exceed SMAQMD thresholds. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	No mitigation measures are available beyond policies, measures, and actions in the Draft General Plan and GGRP.	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.3-3: Generation of Long-Term Operational Regional Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Long-term land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in emissions of ROG and NO _x that exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds of 65 lb/day and result in emissions of PM ₁₀ that would contribute to the County's nonattainment status. Thus, operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this impact would be significant.	S	4.3-3: Implement SMAQMD Design Recommendations for Development Projects. The City shall require that development applicants include all feasible elements from SMAQMD's best available mitigation measures that are available at the time of project design, where required to reduce project level impacts to a less-than-significant level. The applicant shall coordinate with SMAQMD to determine which design recommendations are appropriate for the project and collaborate to develop new mitigation if required. These may include, but are not limited to using certain types of wood burning appliances, architectural coatings, designing certain types of land uses patterns, providing bicycle parking, etc. Please refer to Section 4.4.1 of the SMAQMD CEQA Guide and the SMAQMD Guidance for Land Use Emissions Reduction.	SU
4.3-4: Generation of Long-Term, Operational, Local Mobile-Source Emissions of CO. Local mobile-source emissions of CO would not be expected to substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that would exceed the one-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	LTS
4.3-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). With implementation of the Draft General Plan, proposed sensitive land uses and TAC sources would potentially not be sited to minimize exposure to substantial concentrations of TACs. This impact is significant.	S	No mitigation measures are available beyond policies, measures, and actions in the Draft General Plan and GGRP.	SU
4.3-6: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Odors. There are no major sources of odors located within the planning area, so implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of objectionable odors. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Noise			
4.4-1: Potential for Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction Noise. Short-term construction source noise levels could exceed the applicable City standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. In addition, if construction activities were to occur during more noise-sensitive hours, construction source noise levels could also result in annoyance and/or sleep disruption to occupants of existing and proposed noise-sensitive land uses and create a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. However, the City’s Municipal Code exempts noise associated with construction activities that occur during daytime hours. Compliance with this Municipal Code provision, adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental impact, would result in a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	None required.	LTS
4.4-2: Increases in Ambient Noise Levels. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in new noise-generating uses within areas containing noise-sensitive uses. However, the Draft General Plan includes policies and actions that reduce the potential for noise levels to exceed established standards. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	LTS
4.4-3: Potential for Development of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses in Areas Subject to Noise Impacts. Future development of new noise-sensitive land uses would occur under the Draft General Plan within areas that either are currently affected by noise from transportation noise sources, or will be in the future. However, the Draft General Plan includes policies and actions to reduce the potential for noise levels to exceed established standards. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	LTS

NI = No Impact LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.4-4: Increases in Vibration Levels. Construction of future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could cause a temporary, short-term disruptive vibration if it were to occur near sensitive receptors. Future development of new sensitive land uses could occur within vibration-generating areas (e.g., railroads). However, the Draft General Plan includes policies and actions that reduce the potential for vibration levels to exceed established standards. This impact would be significant.	S	4.4-4: The City shall require project applicants that would generate substantial long-term vibration to provide analysis and mitigation, as necessary, to achieve velocity levels, as experienced at habitable structures of vibration-sensitive land uses, of less than 80 VdB.	LTS
4.5 Water Resources and Water Quality			
4.5-1: Violation of Water Quality Standards. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in additional discharges of pollutants to receiving water bodies from nonpoint sources. Such pollutants would result in adverse changes to the water quality of local water bodies. However, with adoption and implementation of policies and actions in the Draft General Plan, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.5-2: Construction-Related Water Quality Impacts. Construction and grading activities associated with future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could result in soil erosion and stormwater discharges of suspended solids and increased turbidity. Such activities could mobilize other pollutants from project construction sites as contaminated runoff to on-site and ultimately off-site drainage channels. Many construction-related wastes have the potential to degrade existing water quality. Project construction activities that are implemented without mitigation could violate water quality standards or cause direct harm to aquatic organisms. However, with implementation of existing regulations and water quality policies and actions contained in the Draft General Plan, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>4.5-3: Interference with Groundwater Recharge or Substantial Depletion of Groundwater Supplies. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in additional impervious surfaces and the diversion of groundwater to surface water. Resulting reductions in groundwater recharge in the groundwater basins underlying the planning area could affect groundwater levels and the yield of hydrologically connected wells. However, with implementation of Draft General Plan policies and actions, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
<p>4.5-4: On-Site and Downstream Erosion and Sedimentation. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the total volume and peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff. This could alter local drainage patterns, increasing watershed flow rates above the natural background level (i.e., peak flow rates). Increased peak flow rates may exceed drainage system capacities, exacerbate erosion in overland flow and drainage swales and creeks, and result in downstream sedimentation. Sedimentation, in turn, could increase the rate of deposition in natural receiving waters and reduce conveyance capacities, resulting in an increased risk of flooding. Erosion of upstream areas and related downstream sedimentation typically leads to adverse changes to water quality and hydrology. However, with adoption and implementation of the policies and actions in the Draft General Plan, combined with current grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
<p>4.5-5: Exposure of People or Structures to Flood Hazards from Increased Stormwater Runoff. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could result in the development of residential or commercial structures in floodplains, thereby exposing people and structures to flood hazards. However, implementation of policies and actions in the Draft General Plan, combined with enforcement of existing flood control regulations, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.5-6: Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area or Structures in a 100-Year Flood Area that would Impede or Redirect Flood Flows. Portions of the planning area lie within a 100-year flood plain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map. The planning area may potentially be affected by flooding if structures were allowed in these areas. Implementation of the policies and actions in the Draft General Plan, combined with other relevant local regulations, would minimize the potential for effects from flooding. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.5-7: Potential for Failure of a Dam or Levee. The planning area may potentially be affected in the unlikely event of a dam or dike failure at Folsom Lake. Implementation of policies and actions in the Draft General Plan, combined with other relevant state and local regulations, would minimize the potential for effects from dam failure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.6 Biological Resources			
4.6-1: Impact to Special-status Plant Species. Two special-status plant species, stinkbells and bigscale balsam root, are known and have the potential to occur within California annual grassland in the planning area. One special status plant species, Sanford’s arrowhead, is known and has the potential to occur within freshwater marsh along creeks and streams in the planning area as well as along ditches and irrigation canals. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could result in loss or degradation of existing populations or of suitable habitat for these species as described below. This impact is considered significant.	S	4.6-1: For projects that would affect potential habitat for stinkbells, bigscale balsam root, and/or Sanford’s arrowhead, the City shall require surveys and require implementation of avoidance measures or compensatory mitigation as needed. Furthermore, the City shall implement the following measures to mitigate impacts of future projects consistent with the Draft General Plan; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, the City shall require future projects with potential to affect habitat for special-status plant species to evaluate whether they would remove or degrade potentially suitable habitat. This evaluation shall be completed by a qualified biologist and shall be included as part of the project environmental documentation. ▶ Projects that would remove or degrade potentially suitable habitat for special-status plant species shall conduct special-status plant surveys according to established protocols (i.e., DFG 2009 as updated). If surveys are required, the results shall be included as part of the project environmental documentation. 	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If special-status plant populations are identified during protocol-level surveys, project design shall incorporate measures to avoid direct and indirect disturbances of special-status plant populations and their habitat. ▶ If impacts on special-status plant populations cannot be avoided through project design, the City shall require the project applicant to develop and implement a mitigation and monitoring plan to compensate for the loss of special-status plants. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed in coordination with the City and DFG and shall include criteria for success and corrective measures to be implemented if success criteria are not met. Compensatory mitigation may include transplanting existing plants, seed collection and inoculation in other suitable habitat areas, and/or preservation in perpetuity of other existing populations of these species. 	
<p>4.6-2: Impact to Special-status Wildlife Species. Four special-status wildlife species, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, northwestern pond turtle, white-tailed kite and pallid bat are known to occur or have the potential to occur within California annual grassland, interior live oak woodland, and valley foothill riparian habitat in the planning area. Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in loss or degradation of existing populations or of suitable habitat for these species as described below. This impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p>4.6-2a: For projects that would affect valley elderberry longhorn beetle or its habitat, require implementation of avoidance measures and/or compensatory mitigation as needed. The City shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, the City shall require all future projects that would result in vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of native riparian vegetation to conduct a biological resources inventory to determine if elderberry shrubs are present. This vegetation type is typically found near stream corridors that traverse the planning area. The inventory shall be completed by a qualified biologist and shall be included as part of the project application. If elderberry shrubs are identified, but no disturbance is proposed within 100 feet of an elderberry shrub, no further mitigation is required. ▶ If elderberry shrubs are identified, and disturbance is proposed within 100 feet of an elderberry shrub that could 	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>affect valley elderberry longhorn beetle (per USFWS 1999, as updated); the City shall require the project applicant to avoid, minimize, and compensate for effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle consistent with the methods described in Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS 1999), as updated. These methods include establishing and maintaining a buffer zone, protective measures such as barrier fencing and signage, restoration and maintenance of the work area, transplanting affected shrubs, and planting new elderberry plants and associated native species in protected areas.</p> <p>4.6-2b: For projects that would affect aquatic habitat for northwestern pond turtle, the City shall require implementation of avoidance measures. The City shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts to northwestern pond turtle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, the City shall require all future projects that would result in work within streams or ponds to conduct a biological resources inventory to determine if aquatic habitat for northwestern pond turtle is present. This inventory shall be completed by a qualified biologist and shall be included as part of the project application. ▶ Immediately prior to commencement of work in northwestern pond turtle aquatic habitat, a qualified biologist shall perform a survey for northwestern pond turtle. If northwestern pond turtles are found, the biologist will coordinate with DFG to relocate the individuals. Aquatic habitat areas that cannot feasibly be avoided during project construction will be dewatered prior to construction. A qualified monitor shall be available to remove northwestern pond turtles until the work area is fully dewatered, and will be available until work is completed to remove any northwestern pond turtles that may enter the work area. <p>4.6-2c: For projects that would affect white-tailed kite and other raptors (e.g. hawks, owls) protected under Fish and Game Code,</p>	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>the City shall require implementation of avoidance measures. The City shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to white-tailed kite or other raptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, the City shall require all future projects that would result in work within 300 feet of native upland or riparian woodlands to conduct a biological resources inventory to determine if potential nesting habitat for white-tailed kite or other raptors is present. This inventory shall be completed by a qualified biologist and shall be included as part of the project application. ▶ For projects within 300 feet of potential raptor nesting habitat, and where project work will begin from February 1 through August 30, a survey to identify active nests for tree-nesting raptors will be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 2 weeks before the start of construction. Active raptor nests located within 300 feet of the project will be mapped. A determination will be made by a qualified biologist, in coordination with CDFG, as to whether or not construction work would affect the active nest or disrupt reproductive behavior. Criteria used for this evaluation will include, but not be limited to, presence of visual screening between the nest and construction activities, and behavior of adult raptors in response to the surveyors or other ambient human activity. Alternatively, other appropriate avoidance measures approved by CDFG may be implemented to ensure that the nest is protected. If it is determined that construction will not affect an active nest or disrupt breeding behavior, construction may proceed without any restriction or mitigation measure. ▶ If it is determined that construction will affect an active raptor nest or disrupt reproductive behavior, then avoidance is the only mitigation available. Construction will not be permitted within 300 feet of such a nest until a qualified biologist determines that the subject nests are no longer active. 	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>4.6-2d: For projects that would affect pallid bat, the City shall require implementation of avoidance measures. The City shall implement the following measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to pallid bat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, the City shall require all future projects that would result in work on existing bridges to conduct a biological resources inventory to determine if the structures are active roosts for pallid bat. This inventory shall be completed by a qualified biologist and shall be included as part of the project application. ▶ If active roosts are present, a qualified biologist shall supervise the installation of barriers (e.g., screens or other methods acceptable to DFG) at potential roosts to prevent bat use after verifying that no bats would be trapped by the barriers. ▶ If roost sites cannot be screened in advance, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days and no less than 7 days prior to the beginning of any construction activity. If an active roost is found, a determination will be made by a qualified biologist, in coordination with DFG, as to whether or not construction work will affect the site or disrupt roosting behavior. Criteria used for this evaluation will include, but not be limited to, presence of visual and audio screening between the site and construction activities. If construction activities have the potential to threaten the viability of an active maternity site discovered during the survey, then a minimum 100-foot buffer will be flagged around the site and designated a construction-free zone until the site is no longer active or other appropriate avoidance measures, including a reduced buffer size, approved by DFG, are implemented to ensure that the site is adequately protected. Specific implementation of this measure shall be based on conditions at the project site. 	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>4.6-3: Loss of Native Trees and/or Heritage Trees. Construction of infrastructure, roadways, or buildings related to proposed land uses could result in adverse effects on native trees and/or large heritage trees, which provide both aesthetic and wildlife value. With implementation of policies and actions within the Draft General Plan and the City’s Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
<p>4.6-4: Loss and Degradation of Federally Protected Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States and Waters of the State, and Associated Sensitive Natural Communities. Construction of infrastructure, roadways, or buildings related to proposed land uses could result in modifications to jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands and waters of the state, and to riparian vegetation identified by DFG as a Sensitive Natural Community. Proposed land uses could result in alteration or disturbance of wetlands and/or streambeds and/or removal of associated vegetation. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p>4.6-4: For projects that would affect wetlands, streams, and sensitive natural communities, the City shall require no net loss of those communities, in compliance with Draft General Plan Policy 34.3. The City shall implement the following mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on wetlands, streambeds and associated Sensitive Natural Communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The City shall require future projects on sites supporting aquatic resources or natural habitats (i.e. not cultivated or developed), as a condition of project approval, to conduct a biological resources inventory to identify and map wetlands, streams, and sensitive natural communities on the project site. Such inventory shall be completed as part of the complete application for a project. ▶ If it is determined that wetlands, streams, and sensitive natural communities would be affected as part of a project, the project applicant shall be required to demonstrate to the City that the project has ensured no net loss of the resources by obtaining mitigation credits at a mitigation bank approved by DFG or USACE. Alternatively, the applicant can prepare an on-site or off-site habitat restoration or mitigation and monitoring plan. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall include detailed written specifications and work descriptions for the restoration project(s), including, as applicable but not limited to: the geographic boundaries of the project(s); construction methods; timing and sequence; sources of water, including connections to existing waters and uplands; soil properties (e.g., particle size, organic content, etc.); methods for establishing the desired plant communities; plans to control invasive plant 	LTS

NI = No Impact LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		species; proposed grading plans, including elevations and slopes of the substrate; soil management; and erosion control measures.	
4.7 Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources			
4.7-1: Potential for Exposure to Seismic Ground Shaking. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would not result in development of areas prone to strong seismic ground shaking. Implementation of policies in the Draft General Plan and existing regulations would implement best practices to reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to exposure to seismic ground shaking. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.7-2: Potential for Seismic Ground Failure. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in development of areas with moderate potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Implementation of policies in the Draft General Plan and compliance with existing regulations would implement best practices to reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to exposure to seismic ground failure. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.7-3: Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would be constructed on soils with slight to moderate erosion potential, and earth-disturbing and construction activities could result in some soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Compliance with existing regulations would result in use of best management practices to prevent substantial soil erosion and topsoil loss. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.7-4: Potential for Unstable Soils. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable, potentially resulting in on- or off-site lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Implementation of policies in the Draft General Plan and compliance with existing regulations would prevent damage from unstable soils. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.7-5: Construction in Areas with Expansive Soils. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas with expansive soils. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.7-6: Construction of Septic Systems on Poor Soils. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could result in construction of new septic systems on incompatible soils. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.7-7: Possible Damage to Unknown, Potentially Unique Paleontological Resources during Earthmoving Activities. Construction activities associated with future development of land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could disturb previously unknown paleontological resources within the planning area. This impact would be significant.	S	4.7-7: Discovery of Potential Paleontological Resources If potential paleontological resources are detected by construction workers or City staff during construction of future land uses, work shall stop immediately, and consultation is required to avoid further impacts. Actions after work stoppage will be designed to avoid significant impacts to the greatest extent feasible. These measures could include, but are not limited to, construction worker personnel education, consultation with a qualified paleontologist, coordination with experts on resource recovery and curation of specimens, and/or other measures considered appropriate after further consultation.	LTS
4.8 Agricultural Resources			
4.8-1: Loss of Important Farmland. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would not result in the conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses. There is no impact.	NI	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.8-2: Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contracts. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would not result in any conflicts with parcels zoned for agriculture or protected by Williamson Act contracts. There is no impact.	NI	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.8-3: Changes That Could Result in Conversion of Farmland. The planning area does not contain and is not adjacent to any major farmland areas, so adoption and implementation of the Draft General Plan would not result in changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. There is no impact.	NI	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.9 Public Services			
4.9-1: Demand for Additional Police Protection Facilities. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in an increase in population in the planning area and increase the demand for police protection services, which would result in the need for additional and/or expanded police protection facilities. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.9-2: Demand for Additional Fire Protection Facilities. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in an increase in population in the planning area which would increase the demand for fire protection services, requiring additional and/or expanded fire protection facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.9-3: Demand for Additional School Facilities. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in an increase in population in the planning area, including the number of school-aged children, which would result in an increase in demand for school services, which would result in the need for additional and/or expanded school facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.9-4: Need for New or Expanded Parks and/or Recreation Facilities. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would increase the population in the planning area. This would result in an increase in demand for parks and recreation services and the need for additional and/or expanded parks and recreation facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.9-5: Physical Deterioration of Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities due to Increased Use by New Residents. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in increased demand on existing park facilities, which could lead to the accelerated deterioration of these facilities if not properly maintained. However, the Draft General Plan includes policies that match future parkland with future population growth to avoid this impact. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.10 Utilities			
4.10-1: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would require upgrades to wastewater treatment infrastructure; however, the upgrades would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements of either the CVRWQCB or the State Water Resources Control Board. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.10-2: Increase the Generation of Wastewater, Requiring New or Expanded Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Facilities. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would increase demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. It is anticipated that such future uses would generate wastewater in excess of the capacity of existing wastewater treatment facilities, necessitating the expansion of existing or construction of new wastewater facilities. Construction of such facilities could have adverse effects on the physical environment. With implementation of the Draft General Plan policies and actions and the GGRP measures and actions, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.10-3: Increase Stormwater Flows, Requiring the Construction of New or Expanded Stormwater Drainage Facilities. The City would need to provide new and expanded stormwater drainage facilities in order to accommodate future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan. Construction of such facilities could result in significant adverse environmental effects. However, with implementation of Draft General Plan policies and actions and GGRP measures and actions, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.10-4: Increase the Demand for Water, Creating Insufficient Water Supply Available to Serve City Residents at Buildout. The City would need additional water supplies to meet the demand that would be created by future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan. Provision of these water supplies would require the construction of new water supply and distribution facilities, such as groundwater wells. Construction of these facilities could potentially	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
result in adverse impacts on the physical environment. However, with implementation of Draft General Plan policies and actions and GGRP measures and actions, this impact would be less than significant.			
4.10-5: Increase Generation of Solid Waste, Causing a Demand for Additional Landfill Capacity to Accommodate Disposal Needs. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would allow for the development of new homes and businesses within the planning area, which would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste sent to landfills. This impact would be less than less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.10-6: Increased Demand for Private Utility Services. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would increase local demand for electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication services. The extension of these private utility services could potentially result in the need for the development of new or expanded facilities, the construction of which could possibly result in adverse impacts on the physical environment. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.11 Cultural Resources			
4.11-1: Changes to the Historic Character of Citrus Heights. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could affect historic structures or the historic character of Citrus Heights. However, the Draft General Plan contains policies, and actions that would ensure that the context of historic features is considered in future development. Implementation of these policies and actions would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.11-2: Destruction of or Damage to Known Archaeological or Historical Resources. Citrus Heights contains several archaeological and historical cultural resources that may be located within or near redevelopment areas. However, the Draft General Plan contains policies and actions that would ensure that potential prehistoric and historic features are assessed for their significance in advance of future development and redevelopment activities. Impacts on these resources that could affect their potential historic significance could then be mitigated. Implementation of these policies and actions would	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.			
4.11-3: Destruction of or Damage to As-Yet-Unknown Cultural Resources. Individual development projects within the planning area that would involve grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities could disturb or damage any as-yet-undiscovered archaeological resources or human remains. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.11-4: Discovery of Human Remains. The planning area and surrounding areas are known to have been utilized by Native American groups prehistorically, and were settled by European immigrants beginning in the mid-19th Century. While some burial ground locations are known, ground disturbing activities in planning area could encounter prehistoric or historic human remains. This impact is considered to be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.12 Aesthetics			
4.12-1: Degradation of Visual Character. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in some limited urban development and redevelopment that could alter the current visual character present within and surrounding the planning area. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.12-2: New Sources of Light and Glare. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in some limited development of new urban uses and redevelopment which would create new sources of light and glare in the planning area. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.13 Energy			
4.13-1: Increase Demand for and Consumption of Energy. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would increase the demand and consumption of energy. However, the Draft General Plan and GGRP include policies, measures, and actions intended to promote efficient use of energy. This impact is less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact LTS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
4.14 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
4.14-1: Generation of Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Future construction activities related to land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan and GGRP would result in increased generation of GHG emissions. However, the Draft General Plan and GGRP include policies, measures, and actions applicable to large construction projects designed to reduce construction-related GHG emissions. Furthermore, anticipated future construction-related emissions would be below AB 32 efficiency standards. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.14-2: Increases in Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New Development. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would allow for up to 3,577 net new dwelling units and up to 2.9 million net new non-residential square feet. These uses would result in increased generation of GHGs, which would contribute considerably to cumulative GHG emissions. However, anticipated future land use emissions would be below AB 32 efficiency standards. Furthermore, the Draft General Plan and GGRP include policies, measures and actions designed to reduce GHG emissions associated with new development. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.14-3: Consistency with Plans, Policies and Regulations Related to Greenhouse Gases. The Draft General Plan and GGRP include policies and measures that would reduce community-wide GHG emissions by 13.7% below 2005 levels. The City's actions, together with the effects of AB 1493 and Low Carbon Fuel Standards (LCFS) in Citrus Heights would enable a combined reduction of about 24.5% below 2005 levels by 2020. Therefore, the Draft General Plan and GGRP would not conflict with any plans, policies or regulations related to GHG emissions and the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.14-4: Impacts of Anticipated Climate Change Effects on the Planning Area. GHG emissions are expected to result in a variety of effects on the planning area, including reduced hydroelectric energy production, increased energy demand, and decreased water supply.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Uncertainty associated with these impacts, as well as implementation of Draft General Plan policies would make this impact less than significant.			
4.15 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.15-1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal or Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in an increase in the routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials, which could result in exposure of such materials to the public through either routine use or accidental release. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of Draft General Plan policies and actions would reduce potential impacts related to the routine transportation of hazardous materials. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.15-2: Interference with an Adopted Emergency-Response Plan. Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan could create additional traffic and residences requiring evacuation in case of an emergency. However, with implementation of Draft General Plan policies and actions, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS
4.15-3: Public Health Hazards from Project Development on a Known Hazardous Materials Site Compiled Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Several sites within the planning area are listed on the Cortese List as known hazardous materials sites. Implementation of the proposed project could expose construction workers to hazardous materials from these sites during construction, and hazardous materials on-site could create an environmental or health hazard if left in place. This is considered a significant impact.	S	4.15-3a: No projects shall be approved where there is substantial evidence of existing contamination on a Cortese-listed site that would pose an unacceptable risk to the health of construction workers. 4.15-3b: Establish a process that identifies the steps to be taken prior to commencement of any site preparation activities on Cortese-listed sites. This may contain but not be limited to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain a licensed professional to investigate the environmental status of the soils and/or groundwater contamination. Prepare a site plan that identifies and implements any remediation activities that are required to remove health risks to persons exposed to the site during construction activities, 2. Remove all contaminated soil, dispose of contaminated soil by a licensed contractor to a properly licensed facility, and replace contaminated soil with clean fill dirt. 	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		3. Consult with appropriate regulatory agencies such as Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Sacramento Department of Environmental Health to determine what actions are required by these agencies to be implemented (e.g., de-watering, groundwater monitoring, etc.).	
4.15-4: Emission or Handling of Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School. Implementation of the Draft General Plan could result in the development of future land uses that would emit or handle hazardous waste in proximity to new or existing schools. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation needed.	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable