Addendum No. 4 to the Environmental Impact Report on the

Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project



State Clearinghouse # 2008072060



May 2017

Addendum No. 4 to the Environmental Impact Report on the

Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project



State Clearinghouse # 2008072060

Prepared for:

Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency 1007 7th Street, 7th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

Contact:

John A. Bassett Director of Engineering Phone (916) 874-7606 bassettj@SacCounty.NET

Prepared by:

AECOM 2020 L Street, Suite 400 Sacramento, CA 95811

Contact:

Peter Boucher Project Manager Phone (916) 414-5840

May 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ion	Page
INTRODUCTION	
BACKGROUND	
NEED FOR ADDENDUM 4	5
STANDARD FOR PREPARATION OF AN ADDENDUM	6
Subsequent or Supplemental Environmental Impact Reports	6
PROJECT LOCATION	7
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	7
Kaufman Borrow Site	7
Unchanged Elements of the Project Description	
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION	
Issues Not Analyzed Further in this Addendum	
Agricultural Resources	14
Biological Resources	
Cultural Resources	
Transportation and Circulation	
Air Quality	21
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
Noise	23
CONCLUSIONS	25
REFERENCES	

Attachments

Attachment 1	SAFCA Construction Phasing Map
Attachment 2	CEQA Checklist for Screening Subsequent Selection of Borrow Sites

Figures

Figure 1	Regional Location Map	2
Figure 2	SAFCA 2009 Phase 3 EIR Borrow Sites and Haul Routes	3
Figure 3	Site Vicinity Map	8
Figure 4	Kaufman Haul Routes	9
-		

Table

Table 1	Comparison of Haul Rou	es (Kaufman Site to Read	ch B Levee Construction Sites) 12
	Comparison of Haur Rou	cs (Rauman She to Rea	ch D Levee Construction Sites	/ ····· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CVFPB	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
су	cubic yards
dBA	A-weighted decibels
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
ESA	environmental site assessment
FRAQMD	Feather River Air Quality Management District
I-5	Interstate 5
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
Kaufman	Kaufman Ranch
L _{dn}	normally acceptable day-night average noise level
L _{eq}	energy-equivalent noise level
MMRP	mitigation monitoring and reporting plan
NBP	Natomas Basin Project
NCC	Natomas Cross Canal
NEMDC	Natomas East Main Drainage Canal
NLIP	Natomas Levee Improvement Program
NO _X	oxides of nitrogen
PGCC	Pleasant Grove Creek Canal
PM_{10}	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
ROG	reactive organic gases
SAFCA	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SR	State Route
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TPY	tons per year
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

ADDENDUM NO. 4 TO THE NATOMAS LEVEE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PHASE 3 LANDSIDE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) are cooperating with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to construct the Federal phase of the American River Watershed Project, Natomas Basin Project (NBP). The NBP began as SAFCA's Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP), including the Landside Improvements Project, Phases 1, 2, 3, 4a, and 4b. The overall purpose of the NBP and NLIP is to bring the Natomas Basin's entire 42-mile perimeter levee system into compliance with applicable Federal and State standards for levees protecting urban areas. Figure 1 provides a regional location map that depicts the Natomas Basin (Basin) and areas covered by the NBP and NLIP.

The NLIP Phase 3 project involves improving portions of the Basin levee system consisting of the Sacramento River east levee west of Sacramento International Airport (USACE Reach C), the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal (PGCC) west levee north of Sankey Road (USACE Reach E), and the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal (NEMDC) west levee south of West Elkhorn Boulevard (USACE Reach H). Figure 2 depicts the Phase 3 project as evaluated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, including the levee reaches and borrow sites, and the potential routes for hauling earthen material from the borrow sites to the levee construction sites.

BACKGROUND

SAFCA's levee improvement activities have been covered by programmatic and project-level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents including the Local Funding Mechanisms for Comprehensive Flood Control Improvements for the Sacramento Area Environmental Impact Report (Local Funding EIR) (SAFCA 2007a) and the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP) Landside Improvements Project EIR (SAFCA 2007b), which described and evaluated the landside components of the NLIP. Phases 1 and 2 of the NLIP have been completed. The Local Funding EIR described and analyzed NLIP Phase 1 (Natomas Cross Canal Phase 1 Improvements) (see Figure 2), which were constructed in 2007 and included a 500 foot segment of the Sacramento River east levee. The NLIP Phase 2 EIR (SAFCA 2009a) evaluated construction of levees and cutoff walls along the Sacramento River east levee.

The Phase 3 project was described and its environmental impacts evaluated in a draft environmental impact report (EIR) that was distributed to the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, local municipalities, residents, and the relevant resource agencies. The Draft EIR was prepared jointly with a USACE environmental impact statement (EIS) and was published on February 13, 2009 (USACE and SAFCA 2009), followed by a 45-day public review period and a public meeting.

SAFCA then published a Final EIR (SAFCA 2009b) on May 11, 2009, containing responses to comments and a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan (MMRP). The MMRP included mitigation measures addressing the project's potentially significant impacts on the environment, including agricultural resources, biological and cultural resources, traffic, hydrology, water quality, air quality, noise, and hazards. SAFCA certified the EIR, approved the project, and filed the Notice of Determination on May 22, 2009 (State Clearinghouse No. 2008072060). Separately, USACE prepared a Final EIS (USACE 2009) that was issued for public review on August 21, 2009. The Record of Decision was issued on April 2, 2010.



Source: Adapted by AECOM based on CASIL Layers

Figure 1

Regional Location Map



Figure 2

SAFCA 2009 Phase 3 EIR Borrow Sites and Haul Routes

This page intentionally left blank

SAFCA has prepared three previous addenda to the Phase 3 EIR. Addendum 1 addressed the discharge and disposal of pumped groundwater for dewatering excavations required to relocate Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2. Addendum 2 addressed hauling approximately 30,000 cubic yards (cy) of fill material from the Moulton Pile site in south Sacramento to Reach 9B of the Sacramento River east levee improvements. Addendum 3 addressed refinements in the design of the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company Pritchard Lake Pumping Plant.

On August 28, 2009, USACE and SAFCA issued the Phase 4a Draft EIS/EIR for public review and comment. The Phase 4a project involves improving the Sacramento River east levee south of Powerline Road (USACE Reaches A and B) and the American River north levee (USACE Reach I). Following public review, SAFCA published the Final EIR on November 3, 2009 (SAFCA 2009c). The SAFCA Board of Directors certified the EIR in October 2009 and approved the Phase 4a Project on November 13, 2009. The Notice of Determination was filed on November 16, 2009 (State Clearinghouse No. 2009032097). Separately, USACE prepared a Final EIS (USACE 2010) that was issued for public review in February 2010. The Record of Decision was published in November 2010.

SAFCA has prepared four addenda to the Phase 4a EIR. Addendum 1 (February 2011) (SAFCA 2011) addressed several changes in habitat design for Fisherman's Lake and the addition of woodland habitat. Addendum 2 (April 2012) (SAFCA 2012a) addressed the removal of approximately 20,000 cy of spoil material along the West Drainage Canal between Powerline Road and the Reclamation District No. 1000 (RD 1000) Pumping Plant No. 5 inlet channel and the transport of that material to Sacramento River east levee Reaches 10–12B. Addendum 3 (July 2012) (SAFCA 2012b) addressed the additional removal of approximately 15,000 cy of spoil material along the West Drainage Canal near Powerline Road and the transport of that material to the same levee reaches (Reaches 10–12B along the Sacramento River). Addendum 4 (March 2015) (SAFCA 2015) addressed reconfiguring and adding drainage infrastructure to improve water quality in Fisherman's Lake.

The Phase 4b project is the final subphase of the NLIP Landside Improvements Project, and consists of completing improvements to the remaining portions of the Basin's perimeter levee system in the city of Sacramento and in Sutter and Sacramento counties including the NEMDC west levee between Sankey Road and West Elkhorn Boulevard (USACE Reaches F and G). The Phase 4b Draft EIS/EIR was published by SAFCA and USACE on July 2, 2010, to address the remaining levee reaches and the gaps in the improvements of previous phases. The Final EIS/EIR was published on October 22, 2010 (USACE and SAFCA 2010), and certified by the SAFCA Board on November 12, 2010. The Notice of Determination was filed on November 15, 2010 (State Clearinghouse No. 2009112025). USACE published the Record of Decision on May 18, 2011.

As described above, Phases 1 and 2 construction is complete. Phase 3 construction along the Sacramento River east levee is largely complete; however, the USACE plans to complete work along the PGCC (Reach E) in 2021 and part of the NEMDC (Reach H) in 2018. Phase 4a construction from I-5 to just downstream of Powerline Road was completed by SAFCA between 2010 and 2014, with the remaining portions of Reaches A and B to be completed by the USACE over the next two years. Construction of the Phase 4b project on the PGCC, NEMDC, and American River is scheduled for completion in 2024. USACE plans to manage construction of the remaining segments of the NLIP under Phase 4b of the NBP. Attachment 1 provides an overview of the levee segments addressed in each phase and construction status (completed segments are shaded in green).

NEED FOR ADDENDUM 4

SAFCA prepared this addendum (Addendum 4) to the 2009 Phase 3 EIR because, as construction has progressed, new circumstances have arisen, leading to proposed changes in the project, that require additional analysis. Levee construction has proceeded using earthen material from borrow sites throughout the area, as discussed in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR. This addendum addresses proposed changes in the potential sources of borrow material for levee construction in USACE Reaches E, F, and G of the NBP and in haul routes to reach the proposed new borrow site. Because the availability of the planned borrow sites has changed, SAFCA needs an additional source of borrow material. SAFCA is in the process of evaluating a new parcel (the Kaufman site) that could be used as a source of borrow material for levee construction along the PGCC (Phase 3c), along the NEMDC (Phases 3b and

4b), and potentially in Reach B (SAFCA segment 9B [west of Sacramento International Airport] (Phase 3a) and segments 12B–15) (Phase 4a) (see Attachment 1).

STANDARD FOR PREPARATION OF AN ADDENDUM

Under State CEQA Guidelines¹ Section 15164, an addendum to a previously certified EIR is required when minor technical changes in or additions to the project are proposed, but none of the conditions described in the State CEQA Guidelines that require either a subsequent EIR (Guidelines Section 15162) or a supplemental EIR (Guidelines Section 15163) have occurred.

SUBSEQUENT OR SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS

Under Guidelines Section 15162, a subsequent EIR is required whenever any of the following conditions occur:

- substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will
 require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant
 environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
- Under Guidelines Section 15163, a lead or responsible agency may choose to prepare a supplement to an EIR rather than a subsequent EIR if the following conditions occur:
 - any of the conditions described in Guidelines Section 15162 would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR; and
 - only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.

Accordingly, this addendum describes proposed changes in the NLIP Phase 3 project and evaluates the potential environmental effects due to addition of the Kaufman Ranch property (Kaufman) as a borrow site and transport of earthen material along new roadway segments. This addendum concludes that the proposed project changes

¹ The State CEQA Guidelines ("Guidelines") are found in California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*

would not cause new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of previously identified effects, and that there have been no changes in circumstances or new information that should have been known with reasonable diligence that would cause new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of previously identified effects. (See Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164.)

PROJECT LOCATION

The Basin is located at the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers, encompassing approximately 53,000 acres of the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, and Sutter County (Figure 1). The Basin is bordered to the west by the Sacramento River, to the south by the American River, to the north by the Natomas Cross Canal (NCC), and to the east by the PGCC and NEMDC. Figure 3 shows the features of the proposed new Kaufman borrow site and its proximity to the PGCC, in Sutter County on the north side of Sankey Road directly adjacent to Natomas Road and separated from the PGCC by the PGCC west levee. It also shows the proximity of an adjacent residence and adjacent agricultural and industrial land uses. Figure 4 shows the location of the Kaufman site and the haul routes that could be used to transport borrow material from the Kaufman site to levee construction sites around the Basin. These haul routes, use of which are evaluated in this addendum, include portions of the existing off-road haul routes evaluated in previous EIRs (e.g., Natomas Road, Howsley Road) and local roads in the southern portion of the Basin (e.g., El Centro Road, Truxel Road) that were evaluated as haul routes in the Phase 4a and 4b EIRs. New haul routes include portions of cross-basin roads, such as Sankey Road, Riego Road, Powerline Road, and Elverta Road. These road segments were not evaluated as haul routes in the previous NLIP EIRs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section discusses the changes to the proposed project analyzed in this addendum. The Phase 3 EIR identified several potential borrow sites for Phase 3 levee repairs, and evaluated the impacts of developing those borrow sites, transporting the borrow material to the levee construction sites, and completing the levee improvements. This included more than 10 separate areas including the Elkhorn Borrow Area, the Airport North Bufferlands, Brookfield, Krumenacher, RD 1001, and a Twin Rivers Unified School District parcel. The following proposed changes to the Phase 3 project are evaluated in this addendum to the Phase 3 EIR:

- expanding the project footprint to include 75 acres of the Kaufman site, which were not included in the project area in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR,
- ▶ using the expanded Kaufman property as a borrow site, and
- hauling borrow material from the Kaufman borrow site to the Phase 3 and Phases 4a and 4b levee construction sites using new and existing haul routes.

KAUFMAN BORROW SITE

Phase 3 of the Basin levee improvements requires large volumes of earthen material to fortify the landward side of approximately 13 miles of levees. The borrow material sites evaluated in the Phase 3 EIR are located throughout the Basin, including areas west of State Route (SR) 99 adjacent to the levees and north of Sacramento International Airport. SAFCA also identified the Brookfield and Krumenacher sites (Figure 2), both of which are agricultural lands east of SR 99, as sources of borrow material. However, the Brookfield site was used to obtain material for earlier construction (2010–2014) and has limited remaining capacity. SAFCA had planned to obtain approximately 1 million cubic yards of borrow material from the Krumenacher site; however, this site is in the area known as the "Panhandle" and is part of an annexation application to the City of Sacramento, and thus may not be available as a source of borrow material to use when the Brookfield site's capacity is exhausted and to replace the borrow capacity of the Krumenacher site if it is not available when needed.





Site Vicinity Map





Kaufman Haul Routes

This page intentionally left blank

Accordingly, SAFCA is evaluating the Kaufman site as a source of borrow material and proposes to acquire the site if the soils are suitable for borrow material. Preliminary geotechnical studies have been conducted which indicate that the site's soils are suitable to a depth of 5 feet and that the site could provide approximately 600,000 cubic yards of suitable material, which would be sufficient to complete Reaches E, F, and G.

The Kaufman site consists of two parcels (Sutter County Assessor Parcel Nos. 35-150-006 and 35-160-006) which total 95.13 acres in size, and is currently used for agriculture. The California Department of Conservation (DOC) has classified these agricultural lands, which have been used in recent years for rice cultivation, as Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC 2017a). According to Department of Conservation Williamson Act parcel mapping for 2015–2016 (DOC 2017b), neither parcel is encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. Site soils consist of sandy-clay loam. The site is crossed by multiple dikes used to manage irrigation water for rice production (see Figure 3).

The borrow operation at the Kaufman site would involve removing and stockpiling topsoil followed by excavation of borrow material and replacement of the topsoil once borrow material has been extracted. The property would then be returned to agricultural production. The same treatment was applied at the nearby Brookfield site, which provided borrow material for the NCC south levee (Reach D).

This addendum analyzes the proposed addition of approximately 86 acres of the Kaufman site to the NLIP and Phase 3 EIR project footprint for use as a new borrow area. The Phase 3 EIR project boundary currently includes a ¼-mile buffer area adjacent to the PGCC west levee that includes 9 acres of the Kaufman site. Adding the rest of the Kaufman site to the project as a borrow area would extend the project boundary to include the entire Kaufman site, and thus include an additional 86 acres of agricultural land on the floor of the Basin within the project footprint. Allowing for an appropriate setback from Sankey Road and the levee improvements, approximately 80 acres of the site would be available for borrow operations (SAFCA 2017).

This addendum identifies and evaluates existing and new haul routes from the Kaufman site to the levee construction sites for Phase 3 (Reaches B and E) and Phase 4b (Reaches F and G). This comparative evaluation was conducted to support the selection of routes that would minimize the overall haul miles, air pollutant emissions, and exposure to excavation and hauling noise. The addendum also includes the potential new haul routes in the project area.

Because the Kaufman site is adjacent to the PGCC and NEMDC (Phase 3 Reach E and Phase 4b Reaches F and G), haul trucks carrying material for these levees would depart from the Kaufman site and travel east on Sankey Road to Natomas Road to access active work sites via Natomas Road and East Levee Road (see Figure 4). Natomas Road is a north/south two-lane road on top of the levee adjacent to the PGCC which becomes East Levee Road to the south between Riego Road and Elverta Road.

To access Phase 4b levee construction sites (e.g., Reach A, Reach I), haul trucks would take Sankey Road west, turn south on SR 99 and Interstate 5 (I-5), and exit I-5 onto Garden Highway east or west to access active work sites along the American River north levee and Sacramento River east levee. Haul trucks could also use a range of other local roads evaluated in the Phase 4b EIR and shown in Figure 4 (e.g., San Juan Road). To access sites along the Sacramento River in the western portions of Reach A, haul trucks could also take SR 99 south to Interstate 80 to the West El Camino Avenue exit. Trucks would then access Garden Highway via a dirt road adjacent to I-80, Orchard Lane (east of I-80) or El Centro to San Juan (west of I-80) to access construction sites in SAFCA Reaches 13–15 (see Figure 2 and Attachment 1).

Much of the levee construction work has been completed along the north and west sides of the Basin (Phase 2), including along Reaches C and D; therefore, this addendum considers the potential environmental effects of the potential new haul routes to access the remaining construction sites in Reaches B and C west of Sacramento International Airport, including the area under the I-5 overcrossing of the Sacramento River. In addition to the existing off-road haul route (No. 1 in the list below), this addendum evaluates several other potential new east-west haul routes (Nos. 2 through 5) that provide more direct access to these areas. These routes are depicted in

Figure 4 as haul routes to access levee reaches (e.g., Haul Route to Reach A) and include portions of Sankey Road, Riego Road, Powerline Road, and West Elverta Road. Portions of these roadways were not evaluated and approved as potential haul routes in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR or other previous NLIP EIRs. Specifically, these potential haul routes include:

- 1. the off-road haul route to the north along the PGCC, southwest along the NCC, and south along the Sacramento River;
- 2. Sankey Road west across SR 99 to the planned Sankey Road on-road haul route used to haul material to the west from the Sutter Pointe borrow site and then south along the Sacramento River;
- 3. Sankey Road west to SR 99 south (evaluated in previous NLIP EIRs) and west on Riego Road (western portion previously evaluated for transport of material from the Sutter Pointe borrow site);
- 4. Sankey Road to the west across SR 99, south on Powerline Road, and west on West Elverta Road (previously evaluated to transport material from the Dunmore borrow site); and
- 5. Sankey Road west to SR 99 south and west on West Elverta Road (western portion previously evaluated to transport material from the Dunmore borrow site).

The following provides a screening-level evaluation of these potential haul routes based on haul distance, air pollutant emissions, and exposure to haul truck noise. The analysis was conducted to identify the most effective haul route and any potential environmental impacts that were not sufficiently covered in the Phase 3 (or Phase 4a or 4b) EIR, such as noise-sensitive receptors closer to the haul routes than previously identified.

Table 1 compares five potential haul routes, beginning with the previously approved "off-road" haul route that parallels the PGCC and Sacramento River (No. 1). To use this route, trucks would travel to the north along the PGCC, southwest along the NCC, and south along the Sacramento River. SAFCA used this route (including Howsley Road and rights of way just east of Garden Highway) to construct levees along the NCC and Sacramento River. Garden Highway is a north/south two-lane roadway that extends along the entire western edge of the Basin along the Sacramento River and provides primary access for residences along the waterside of the Sacramento River east levee.

	Potential Haul Routes	Haul Route Screening Information		
1.	Off-road haul route to the north and south along the PGCC	Miles to Reach 9B: 14.5		
	and Natomas Cross Canal (and Sacramento River)	Miles of dirt road: 4.2 (Howsley Road)		
		Noise-sensitive receptors: Residences along 8 miles of		
		completed Phase 2 levees (SAFCA Reaches 1–9A)		
2.	Sankey Road west to access the planned Sankey Road on-	Miles to Reach 9B: 13.2		
	road haul route identified for hauling material to the west	Miles of dirt road: 3 (Sankey Road)		
	from the Sutter Pointe borrow site (crossing SR 99, and then	Noise-sensitive receptors: Residences along 8 miles of		
	continuing south along the Sacramento River)	completed Phase 2 levees (SAFCA Reaches 1–9A)		
3.	Sankey Road west to SR 99 south and west on Riego Road	Miles to Reach 9B: 14		
	(western portion evaluated for Sutter Pointe)	Miles of dirt road: 0		
		Noise-sensitive receptors: Residences along 5.7 miles of		
		completed Phase 2 levees (SAFCA Reaches 4A–9A)		
4.	Sankey Road to the west across SR 99, south on Powerline	Miles to Reach 9B: 13.4		
	Road, and west on West Elverta Road (evaluated for	Miles of dirt road: 2.6 (Sankey, Powerline)		
	Dunmore)	Noise-sensitive receptors: Residences along 3.5 miles of		
		completed Phase 2 levees (SAFCA Reaches 5B–9B)		
5.	Sankey Road west to SR 99 south and west on West Elverta	Miles to Reach 9B: 13.5		
	Road (western portion evaluated for Dunmore)	Miles of dirt road: 0		
		Noise-sensitive receptors: Residences along 3.5 miles of		
		completed Phase 2 levees (SAFCA Reaches 5B-9B)		
No	Notes: SAFCA = Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency; SR = State Route			
So	urce: Data compiled by AECOM in 2017			

 Table 1. Comparison of Haul Routes (Kaufman Site to Reach B Levee Construction Sites)

Compared to the route along the Sacramento River, where there are numerous residences, the roads that cross the Basin offer haul routes with shorter driving distances and more infrequent stops (and thus less air pollutant emissions), fewer noise-sensitive receptors, and more suitable (paved) roadway conditions (Table 1, Nos. 2–5). Sankey, Riego, and West Elverta roads are oriented east-west and traverse agricultural and commercial areas. Portions of these roads were evaluated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR and would have been used to transport material from the Sutter Pointe and Airport North Bufferlands borrow sites. Powerline Road is a north/south two-lane roadway that parallels SR 99, providing an alternate north/south route to Garden Highway and SR 99 from Sankey Road in Sutter County to Garden Highway in Sacramento County. Subsequent to the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, interchanges were constructed on SR 99 at West Elverta Road and Riego Road.

The environmental evaluation in this addendum assumes that haul trucks would access work areas west of Sacramento International Airport (Reaches B and C) by crossing the Basin and avoiding the longer levee road to the north that parallels adjacent waterways. It assumes trucks would depart the Kaufman site to the west on Sankey Road, travel south on SR 99 or Powerline Road, and access Garden Highway using West Elverta Road (Nos. 4 and 5). These routes minimize the distance traveled and noise impacts. Sankey Road west of SR 99 and a portion of Powerline Road south of Riego Road are dirt roads. Using SR 99 to West Elverta Road west would eliminate 2.6 miles of travel on dirt roads, would minimize noise exposure, and would be among the shorter routes.

UNCHANGED ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Kaufman property would be developed as a borrow site (used to remove levee material) and reclaimed in the same manner as the previously proposed borrow sites and all applicable, previously adopted mitigation measures from the Phase 3 EIR would be implemented. The overall number of truckloads of material required would not change, because the amount of material needed would be determined by the levee repair work, which is described and evaluated in the Phase 3, 4a, and 4b EIRs. In addition, the existing EIR mitigation measures are referenced in this addendum and have not changed.

The Kaufman site would be used to obtain material for the Phase 3 levee sites and for levee sites identified in the Phase 4a and 4b EIRs. These sites are immediately south of the Phase 3 PGCC levee construction sites and the work planned for these areas was addressed in the NLIP Phase 4a and 4b EIRs.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

This addendum revises the CEQA analyses presented in the Phase 3 (and Phases 4a and 4b) EIR that could be affected by the proposed changes in the Phase 3 project. Accordingly, the analysis focuses on impacts at the Kaufman site from excavation of borrow material (i.e., impacts on agricultural land and biological and cultural resources) and impacts along the haul routes on air quality, noise, and traffic. It also addresses the potential to encounter hazardous materials and related environmental effects.

ISSUES NOT ANALYZED FURTHER IN THIS ADDENDUM

The proposal to add the Kaufman site and haul material from that location along existing and new haul routes constitutes a change in the approved Phase 3 project as analyzed in the certified Phase 3 EIR. Based on the borrow area program and the procedures for evaluating new borrow sites described in the Phase 3 EIR, SAFCA used the program-specific checklist from Appendix J of the Phase 3 EIR to determine whether a subsequent or supplemental EIR would be required. The checklist contains a three-step process for determining whether a specific borrow site has been sufficiently analyzed, or if the use of the borrow site would require preparation of a new CEQA environmental review document. The checklist is used to determine whether the borrow site would result in a new significant impact, whether the use of the borrow site would substantially increase the severity of a significant impact by causing significant impacts to become significant and unavoidable even with implementation of the mitigation measures that were previously adopted and incorporated into the project, and whether the borrow site was included in previously identified significant (or significant and unavoidable) impacts.

This checklist (Attachment 2) assumes implementation of previously adopted mitigation measures, and that the environmental commitments identified in the Phase 3 EIR would be implemented including storm water best management practices, complying with required permits, wetland creation, biological resources surveys, implementing management agreements, cultural resources surveys, traffic controls, air emissions controls, noise reduction, and soils and groundwater investigations, as appropriate.

Based on the environmental attributes of the Kaufman site and completion of the checklist in light of previously adopted mitigation measures and environmental commitments from the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, SAFCA determined that because the Kaufman site was not considered in the previous identification of significant impacts an addendum to the Phase 3 was the appropriate document to prepare pursuant to Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164. SAFCA also determined, based on the checklist and this Addendum, that using the Kaufman site as a borrow area would not cause a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts evaluated in the Phase 3 EIR for the categories listed below because those resource areas will not be affected by the proposed changes. Therefore, the impact categories listed below are not addressed further in this addendum. The levee construction work and many of the haul routes leading to those sites were covered in previous NLIP EIRs and are part of the Phase 3 project or NLIP program. The proposed changes in the project, which are analyzed in this addendum, involve a new source of a portion of the needed levee construction material, and use of alternative haul routes to deliver materials from the proposed new borrow site to Reach B. The proposed changes would not result in new significant impacts, a substantially increase in the severity of previously evaluated impacts, or require new mitigation measures for the following resource areas:

- ► land use, socioeconomics, population, and housing;
- geology and soils;
- hydrology and hydraulics;
- ► water quality;
- ▶ fisheries;
- paleontological resources;
- recreation;
- visual resources;
- utilities and service systems;
- airport safety;
- wildfire hazards; and
- environmental justice.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates potential impacts on agricultural lands from adding the Kaufman site as a borrow site for levee construction material. As described above, the DOC has classified these agricultural lands as Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC 2017a), and according to Williamson Act parcel mapping for 2015–2016 (DOC 2017b), the site is not encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. The proposed project change would involve using the Kaufman site, which has recently been used for rice cultivation, as a borrow site. The site would be excavated to a depth of approximately 5 feet.

As evaluated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, borrow sites in the eastern portion of the Natomas Basin would be reclaimed by replacing the topsoil and returned to agricultural use. Therefore, such sites would not be permanently converted to nonagricultural use but this short-term impact was considered significant and unavoidable and SAFCA adopted Mitigation Measure 4.1-a, "Minimize Important Farmland Conversion to the Extent Practicable and Feasible." For the Kaufman site, SAFCA would continue to implement this previously adopted mitigation measure, which requires SAFCA to minimize disruption of agricultural utilities, locate staging areas away from active farmland, and use existing access roads to the extent possible. The EIR determined that for sites that would be reclaimed and returned to agricultural use, any long-term impacts would be less than significant.

As described above, using the Kaufman site as a borrow site would have a short-term impact on agricultural land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance, as the site would not be farmed while it is being excavated. The existing 2009 Phase 3 EIR mitigation measure would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level and thus this short-term impact would be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, no new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates potential impacts on biological resources from adding the Kaufman Ranch property as a borrow site for levee construction material. A biological reconnaissance field survey was conducted for the site on March 23, 2017. In addition, information pertaining to special-status plant and wildlife species was compiled by searching the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Information for Planning and Consultation (USFWS 2017), the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB 2017), and the Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants (CNPS 2017).

The habitat types at the Kaufman site are similar to those at the other borrow sites addressed in the Phase 3 EIR (including the recently used Brookfield site), and consist of agricultural land used to cultivate rice, disturbed/ruderal areas, and an irrigation canal that borders the Kaufman site to the north and northwest. At the time of the site visit, the rice fields were fallow. Approximately 9 acres of this site were previously evaluated as part of the project footprint (Reach E) in the Phase 3 EIR. The potential for occurrence of special-status species and the types of biological resources observed at the Kaufman site are very similar to those addressed in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR.

The 2009 Phase 3 EIR identified soil borrow excavation as having the potential to temporarily impair water quality through sedimentation and increased turbidity and to affect aquatic habitats and fish species. Potential impacts on fish at the Kaufman borrow site would be similar to the impacts discussed in the Phase 3 EIR and would be significant. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR water quality Mitigation Measure 4.6-a, "Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-a, 'Implement Standard Best Management Practices, Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Conditions'; and Mitigation Measure 4.5-c, 'Implement Best Management Practices and Comply with NPDES Permit Conditions for a Point-Source Discharge.'"

The use of borrow material from the Kaufman site could require the permanent fill of irrigated wetlands, if they are present within the rice field, and the temporary fill of the irrigation canal. The 2009 Phase 3 EIR identified mitigation for potential impacts on wetlands and waters that requires performing a wetland delineation to identify which aquatic features are jurisdictional; determining impact acreage; obtaining necessary permits; and developing detailed aquatic habitat designs and management protocols in coordination with the regulatory agencies. The Phase 3 EIR determined that without these measures, the project would result in a potentially significant impact on wetlands and waters of the United States. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to follow this same approach for the Kaufman site by implementing previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-a, *"Minimize Effects on Jurisdictional Waters of the United States, Complete Detailed Design of Habitat Creation Components and Secure Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation of Waters Filled, and Comply with Section 404, Section 401, Section 10, and Section 1602, Permit Processes."* Additionally, because the NLIP programmatic mitigation features were designed to provide more created wetland than would be filled by construction, the small wetlands that may be identified on the Kaufman site also would be covered by the advance mitigation features and no net loss of wetlands would occur.

The irrigation canal and potential irrigated wetlands (if present within the rice field) could also provide habitat for three special-status plants—rose mallow, Delta tule pea, and Sanford's arrowhead—as determined in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR. Disturbance of seasonal wetlands, if present, or temporary fill of the canal could affect these habitats and result in significant adverse impacts on special-status plants. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-a, "Conduct Focused Surveys for Special-Status Plants, Minimize Effects, and Compensate for Loss of Habitat."

The irrigation canal and rice field, when flooded, provide potential aquatic habitat for giant garter snake. Excavating the Kaufman site to obtain borrow material could result in significant adverse impacts through temporary loss and disturbance of potential giant garter snake habitat, and could result in direct disturbance and loss of individual giant garter snakes. Using haul routes to and from the Kaufman site could also result in direct loss of individuals if they are crossing the roads used as haul routes; this would be a significant impact. The original analysis of impacts on giant garter snake habitat anticipated that regulatory permits issued in connection with NLIP Phase 2 would require a suite of giant garter snake habitat mitigation to compensate for temporary losses of habitat. The Kaufman site would be reclaimed after being used to obtain borrow material, and therefore would be consistent with these expectations. In addition, to minimize the potential for direct loss of giant garter snake, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-c, "*Minimize the Potential for Direct Loss of Giant Garter Snake Individuals, Develop Detailed Design of Managed Marsh and New Canals and Management Agreements to Ensure Adequate Compensation for Loss of Habitat, Implement all Management Agreements, and Obtain Incidental Take Authorization.*"

The irrigation canal could also provide habitat for northwestern pond turtle. Disturbance or temporary fill of the canal could result in a significant adverse impact through direct loss of northwestern pond turtle individuals. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-e, *"Conduct Focused Surveys for Northwestern Pond Turtles and Relocate Turtles, if Needed."*

No Swainson's hawk or other raptor or migratory bird nests were observed at the site and no potential nest trees for Swainson's hawk or other raptors are present on-site. However, potential nest trees are present in adjacent areas and potential nesting habitat for migratory birds is present on the project site. Excavation and hauling would occur during the nesting season for Swainson's hawk and other birds, and site activity could disturb nesting behavior, causing nest abandonment and loss of eggs or young, if Swainson's hawk or other birds are nesting onsite or nearby. This would result in a potentially significant adverse impact. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-f, "*Minimize Potential Impacts on Swainson's Hawk and Other Special-Status Birds' Foraging and Nesting Habitat, Monitor Active Nests during Construction, Develop and Implement a Management Plan in Consultation with DFG, Obtain Incidental Take Authorization', and Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-a, 'Minimize Effects on Woodland Habitat, Complete Detailed Design of Woodland Creation and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation for Loss of Quantity and Quality of Habitat, Implement all Agreements, and Comply with the DFG Section 1602 Permit Process.*'" In addition, the terms of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Section 1600 permit, as specified in 2014 Phase 3 EIR Addendum 3, address potential impacts on nesting birds and would apply to the Kaufman site.

Potential habitat for burrowing owl is present adjacent to the site along the PGCC. Extracting material from the Kaufman site could disturb nesting behavior, causing nest abandonment and loss of eggs or young, if burrowing owls are nesting in nearby areas. This would result in a potentially significant adverse impact. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-g, "*Minimize Potential Impacts on Burrowing Owls and Relocate Owls as Needed*."

As described above, using the Kaufman Ranch as a borrow site could affect biological resources, including wetlands, special-status plants, and wildlife including giant garter snake. However, the existing 2009 Phase 3 EIR mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. No new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates potential impacts on cultural resources from adding the Kaufman Ranch property as a borrow site for levee construction material. A site investigation was conducted, which included a records search conducted on March 9, 2017, through the California Historical Resources Information System; a Sacred Lands File search conducted on March 22, 2017, by the Native American Heritage Commission; and a pedestrian

archaeological survey conducted by AECOM on March 23, 2017. Detailed results of the records search, the Sacred Lands File search, and field survey are presented in the Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum presented in Appendix A.

The records search identified two historic-era cultural resources within 0.25 mile of the Kaufman site. One resource (P-51-0083) is the PGCC, which runs along the eastern site boundary of the site and is a subject of the SAFCA NLIP's levee construction and repair efforts. The other resource consists of the structural remnants of a feed mill (P-51-0084) located east of the levee and canal, on the east side of the Union Pacific railroad tracks located to the east of Natomas Road. No evidence of archaeological resources was identified at the Kaufman site during field investigations. Therefore, the proposed project modifications would not result in new or substantially more adverse significant impacts than those described in the Phase 3 EIR related to damage to a significant archaeological resource.

The entire site surface would be excavated for levee construction material down to approximately 5 feet. SAFCA will complete detailed geotechnical investigations of the site after the site is acquired to determine the depth of excavation and suitability of the materials for use in levee construction). Although no aboveground archaeological sites were identified during the field surveys, excavation could uncover buried archaeological deposits. As was determined during the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, such excavations could result in potentially significant impacts.

Therefore, to minimize the potential for loss of undiscovered cultural resources, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-d, "*Train Construction Workers Before Construction, Monitor Construction Activities, Stop Potentially Damaging Activities, Evaluate Discovery(ies), Resolve Adverse Effects on Eligible Resources, if Encountered, and Conduct Additional Backhoe and Canine Forensic Investigations as Appropriate.*" This measure requires training construction workers in identification of cultural resources and treatment protocols, monitoring construction, evaluating discoveries, and completing additional investigations as needed.

Similarly, excavating the Kaufman site has the potential to disturb human remains. However, there is no indication, from either the archival research results or the archaeological survey, that the site has been used for human burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Nevertheless, in the event that human remains are inadvertently discovered during excavation, they would be subject to inadvertent damage or disturbance, which could result in a significant impact. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-d, as described above. Additionally, previously adopted Mitigation Measure 3.4-d, *"Conduct Additional Backhoe and Canine Forensic Investigations as Appropriate,"* and Mitigation Measure 4.1-c, *"Stop Work Within An Appropriate Radius Around the Find, Notify the Applicable County Coroner and Most Likely Descendant, and Treat Remains in Accordance with Measures Stipulated in an HPTP Developed in Consultation between USACE, SAFCA, and the SHPO," from the NLIP Phase 2 supplemental EIR (SAFCA 2009a)* would continue to be implemented. These measures require limited work stoppages and proper handling if human skeletal remains are discovered.

As described above, using the Kaufman Ranch as a borrow site could affect undiscovered cultural resources, including archaeological resources and human remains. However, continuing to implement the existing 2009 Phase 3 EIR mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. No new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

This section analyzes the potential impacts on traffic circulation and transportation systems of hauling material from the Kaufman site to levee construction sites, and the potential impacts related to emergency vehicle access. This analysis is based on use of the following haul routes, as described above in the project description:

- Existing off-road haul route (Natomas Road and East Levee Road) from Sankey Road to the north and south to access levee construction sites in Reaches E, F, and G.
- Sankey Road to SR 99 south to I-80 to West El Camino Avenue (and other local roads) to access Garden Highway and levee construction sites in the southern portion of the Basin (Reaches B, A, and I).
- ► Sankey Road to SR 99 south (or Powerline Road) to West Elverta Road and Garden Highway to access levee construction sites along the Sacramento River, including in Reaches B and C (including the area under I-5).

Part of this analysis qualitatively examines (based on review of project mapping) possible haul routes from the Kaufman site to construction sites and previously evaluated routes from the Brookfield and Krumenacher sites. The analysis determined whether using the Kaufman site and the selected haul route(s) would result in an overall reduction in hauling miles when compared with hauling material from the Brookfield and Krumenacher sites. SAFCA has determined that the overall number of haul miles would be approximately the same as or less than the haul miles for the project as planned, for the following reasons:

- The Kaufman site is within the Basin and would not require haul trucks to use regional highways to access much of the project area.
- Like the Brookfield site, the site is located directly adjacent to, and equidistant from, levee construction sites along the PGCC and USACE Reach E.
- Like the Krumenacher site, the site is located directly adjacent to, and equidistant from, levee construction sites along the NEMDC and USACE Reaches F and G.
- The Kaufman site is closer than either the Brookfield or Krumenacher sites to the remaining construction area in Reach C (Pritchard Lake Pumping Plant).
- Borrow sites in the western portion of the Basin will continue to supply most of the material for levee improvements along the Sacramento and American Rivers.

Although the Krumenacher site is adjacent to areas with large material needs in Reach H and Phase 4b sites along the American River, using the Kaufman site instead would not result in a substantial change in the haul miles required to access the remaining construction sites.

The discussion of traffic impact, below, focuses on the potential for localized traffic impacts near the Kaufman site and along the selected haul routes. That is because using the Kaufman site would add haul truck trips on the selected routes (e.g., Sankey Road), and workers commuting from different areas would contribute to those traffic impacts. The Phase 3 (and 4a and 4b) project covers a large area, and there is considerable uncertainty regarding the timing of levee construction, the extent to which existing borrow sites could provide the needed material, the mix of truck traffic from existing and new borrow sites, and the exact haul routes that would be used. Therefore, the construction traffic analysis for the Kaufman site uses methods developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) (1988). To account for the large percentage of heavy trucks associated with construction, ITE recommends using the threshold of 50 or more new peak-direction trips. Consequently, the changes in the proposed project would result in a significant impact on traffic (i.e., would be considered to cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system) if the project would result in 50 or more new truck trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour.

As described in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, the planned Phase 3 levee construction required an estimated 2.4 million cubic yards of earthen material. Accordingly, SAFCA identified numerous soil borrow sites, both within and near the Basin. The Phase 3 EIR also acknowledges that additional borrow sources may be needed for environmental, geotechnical, or other reasons. The planned borrow sites for Phase 3 were identified on Plate 10 of the EIR (see Attachment 1) and included, among others, the Elkhorn Borrow Area, Airport North Bufferlands, Sutter Pointe,

Dunmore, Brookfield, and Krumenacher. Therefore, as described in the Phase 3 EIR, the specific locations of the earthen material for particular reaches was unknown because of ongoing investigations of potential borrow sites.

The Phase 3 EIR evaluated the potential impacts of the project to the extent feasible, and stated that borrow sites identified after EIR approval would be subject to additional evaluation. There is some ongoing uncertainty in the evaluation of the traffic impacts of transporting earthen material because of the changing availability of borrow sites. Indeed, this addendum examines adding the Kaufman site because of changes in the availability of the Brookfield and Krumenacher sites. The following paragraphs evaluate the potential traffic impacts for the roads that would be used to access the remaining levee construction areas, including the potential effects of traffic increases and traffic hazards, and potential effects on emergency response.

TEMPORARY TRAFFIC INCREASES

NBP Reaches E, F, and G – This addendum assumes that haul trucks would access Reaches E, F, and G using Sankey Road, Natomas Road, and East Levee Road. As described in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, the levees along the PGCC and NEMDC would be widened and would require approximately 475,000 and 225,000 cubic yards, respectively. SAFCA had planned to obtain a large volume of this material from the Brookfield site; however, this site has since been used to widen other levees and SAFCA is now planning to use the Kaufman site instead. The material would be removed with a scraper and transported (if within a mile) or trucked (15-cubic-yard haul truck) to the levee construction site using the east portion of Sankey Road and the approved levee haul roads (Natomas Road and East Levee Road).

Excavation and transport to these reaches would require 100–200 haul trips per day, daily commute trips by construction workers, and transport of equipment and supplies, including on Sankey Road where it intersects Natomas Road (not evaluated in prior NLIP EIRs). Haul trucks would use the routes described above, whereas workers would use a wider range of regional and local roadways. The size of the Phase 3 crew was estimated at 175 workers; however, this estimate included workers at the levee sites. The number of workers traveling to the Kaufman site would likely be substantially smaller and dispersed across the region, and the number of trips could be reduced by ridesharing, and peak hour trips could be reduced by off-peak start and finish times. Therefore, traffic from construction crew commutes is unlikely to substantially affect local roadways, even during the peak a.m. and p.m. hours.

This traffic analysis assumes the export of material from the Kaufman site would result in 200 trips per day – the upper limit of the range of trips described in the Phase 3 EIR (100–200) and that worker trips (15–20 workers) are included in the 200. Assuming haul trucks would operate 10 hours per day, the number of haul truck trips would average approximately 20 trucks per hour. This daily traffic volume would result in an increase in local traffic; however, the resulting 20 trips per hour would be below the ITE criterion of 50 trucks per hour. In addition, much of the activity would occur on off-road haul roads and any road closures would be limited. Nevertheless, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measure 4.12-b, which applies to the entire Phase 3 project and requires SAFCA to implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-a, "*Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction-Related Truck Trips.*" This previously adopted measure requires SAFCA to prepare a traffic control plan and coordinate with the construction contractors and local and regional agencies regarding traffic distribution along haul routes and establishment of alternative traffic routes.

Reaches A and I – The Kaufman site also may provide material for Phase 4b levee construction in Reaches A and I (and adjacent portions of Reach B [SAFCA segments 12B–15]), which are further from this site. This material would be hauled on Sankey Road west to SR 99 and south into the city of Sacramento, where trucks would use a combination of regional highways and local roads that were evaluated in the Phase 4b EIR. If material from the Kaufman site is used for construction in only these reaches (conservatively assuming all truck trips to Reaches A and I, with none to Reaches E, F, and G), it could produce approximately 100–200 haul trips per day plus worker commutes (approximately 20 trips per day), which would be below the ITE criterion of 50 truck trips per hour. As described above, SAFCA would continue to implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-b for the entire Phase 3 project.

This previously adopted measure requires SAFCA to implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-a, "Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction-Related Truck Trips."

Reaches B and C – Previous Phase 3 levee construction along the Sacramento River has been completed using material from borrow sites in the western part of the Basin, including the Airport North Bufferlands and South Sutter sites. Material from these areas was transported via the western segments of Sankey, Riego, and West Elverta roads, and on unpaved temporary access roads. However, although more distant from the Kaufman site compared with borrow areas west of SR 99, material from the Kaufman site may be needed to close the remaining gaps, including the area under I-5 and at the Pritchard Lake Pumping Plant.

As described in the project description, SAFCA would transport material to these areas using routes that cross the Basin from east to west rather than peripheral off-road routes, such as Howsley Road. This route would include, but would not be limited to, Sankey Road, SR 99 south, Riego Road, Powerline Road, and West Elverta Road. Several of these roadway segments (e.g., West Elverta Road between SR 99 and Lone Tree Road) were not evaluated in previous EIRs.

If all trips departing the Kaufman site were bound for Reach B, the project could produce approximately 100–200 haul trips per day plus worker commutes (approximately 20 trips per day), which would be below the ITE criterion of 50 truck trips per hour. As described above, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 Mitigation Measure 4.12-b for the entire Phase 3 project. This measure requires SAFCA to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measure 4.12-a, "*Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction-Related Truck Trips.*"

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC HAZARDS

Excavation and transport of material would result in increased volumes of slow-moving truck traffic on some rural roadways, including roadway segments not evaluated in previous EIRs. Roadway pavements in these rural areas of Sacramento and Sutter counties were designed to carry low traffic volumes, and increased heavy truck traffic could accelerate wear and tear. In addition, truck traffic could result in road damage, such as cracks and potholes, which could create road hazards for other motorists. In addition, trucks could track mud and impede traffic as they enter and exit the borrow site. The 2009 Phase 3 EIR identified these types of hazards as a potentially significant impact. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-b, which requires SAFCA to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measure 4.12-a, "*Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction-Related Truck Trips.*" Specifically, the traffic safety and control plans will contain measures that require SAFCA to reduce hazards by removing mud from roadways and coordinating with Sacramento and Sutter counties to address roadway maintenance and repair. The EIR states that these measures would reduce these traffic hazards to a less-than-significant level.

TEMPORARY DISRUPTION OF EMERGENCY SERVICE RESPONSE TIMES AND ACCESS

Excavating at the Kaufman site and hauling the material to project improvement areas could result in delays in emergency service response times because emergency vehicles may need to pass near the Kaufman site or cross the haul routes described above. As described in the Phase 3 EIR, material hauling would result in increased truck traffic on local roadways associated with construction trips, including roadways not evaluated in previous EIRs (such as at the intersection of Sankey Road and Natomas Road). Increased traffic congestion could also interfere with local emergency evacuation routes. Because the project could result in delays in emergency service response times, this impact is considered potentially significant. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Phase 3 Mitigation Measure 4.12-c, "*Notify Emergency Service Providers about Project Construction and Maintain Emergency Access or Coordinate Detours with Providers*." Implementing this mitigation measure would reduce the temporary impact on emergency service response times and access to a less-than-significant level by providing preconstruction notification of all appropriate emergency service providers in Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Sacramento and coordinating with providers throughout the construction period to ensure that emergency access through construction areas is maintained.

As described above, excavation at the Kaufman site and hauling material from that location would increase traffic on adjacent roads and haul routes to levee construction sites. However, because of the low truck traffic volumes departing the Kaufman site and with implementation the existing required mitigation measures from the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, any traffic impacts on the roads that access the remaining levee construction sites would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

AIR QUALITY

This section evaluates the air quality impacts of adding the Kaufman Ranch property to the borrow sites used to complete Phases 3, 4a, and 4b. Air quality impacts would occur near the Kaufman site during excavation, and along the selected haul routes due to truck trips to and from the site. As described in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, these emissions would be short term or temporary, and would include criteria air pollutants, primarily dust or respirable particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter $[PM_{10}]$) and ozone precursors (e.g., reactive organic gases [ROG] and oxides of nitrogen $[NO_X]$).

Adding the Kaufman site and transporting material derived from the site would not result in a substantial increase in criteria pollutants. The Kaufman site would replace a significant portion of the material that would have been excavated from the Brookfield or Krumenacher sites. SAFCA was planning to obtain up to approximately 1 million cubic yards from the Krumenacher site, whereas the Kaufman site may produce up to approximately 600,000 cubic yards. Therefore, the overall impact of excavation emissions in the more urbanized area of the Basin would be less.

Similarly, as described in the description of the proposed project changes and the haul route screening comparison, above, adding the Kaufman site would not result in a substantial change in haul miles and could result in an overall reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The Kaufman site is closer to Reaches F and G, where substantial levee construction would occur under Phase 4b, and is closer to the southern part of the Basin and levee construction sites along the American River. Furthermore, the site is marginally closer to the remaining sites along the Sacramento River in Reach B (e.g., under I-5 west of Sacramento International Airport). To reach this area, the longer, previously approved haul route on the levees to the north (Natomas Road and Howsley Road) would be avoided. Moreover, the use of roadway segments crossing the Basin floor that are unpaved and could result in substantial dust emissions would be minimized.

The 2009 Phase 3 EIR evaluated project emissions from temporary, short-term construction as well as local mobile-source emissions and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions using methods consistent with guidance from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) (see Phase 3 EIR, Table 4.13-1). Based on these calculations, the overall Phase 3 project resulted in maximum unmitigated daily emissions that exceeded SMAQMD and FRAQMD thresholds. Because of the Phase 3 project's overall magnitude and intensity, including obtaining borrow material, hauling the material and constructing new levees, reconfiguring the borrow sites (including adding the Kaufman site) would not substantially change the project's overall emissions and could reduce short-term emissions. However, given the area's nonattainment status, the project's overall unmitigated emissions would remain significant as levee construction proceeds.

Therefore, SAFCA would continue to implement the previously adopted mitigation measures from the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, including Mitigation Measure 4.11-a to reduce temporary emissions during construction, *"Implement Measures and Guidelines of the Applicable Air District(s) to Reduce Construction-Generated Emissions of Air Pollutants."* This measure includes implementing all feasible, current mitigation measures and air district guidelines, including those for construction vehicle emissions, equipment maintenance, and the use of electric equipment where feasible. It also includes a range of measures to limit dust, including limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved roadways to 15 miles per hour and watering exposed areas, and other measures to limit exhaust emissions such as minimizing idling time. However, even with these extensive measures, and given the area's nonattainment status, air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, both for Phase 3 and cumulatively for the program when considered together with Phases 4a and 4b.

The 2009 Phase 3 EIR evaluated construction-generated emissions using worst-case assumptions (see EIR Table 4.13-3). With Mitigation Measure 4.13-a, the estimated emissions were 23 tons per year (TPY) of ROG, 104 TPY of NO_x, and 209 TPY of PM₁₀. Based on the modeling conducted, the unmitigated emissions conflicted with applicable air quality planning efforts. However, with mitigation, and because the new borrow site (Kaufman) is more centrally located than the Krumenacher site, based on the qualitative comparison of the borrow site sizes and selected haul routes, emissions would be reduced to below the Federal *de minimis* thresholds and less than the emissions described in the Phase 3 EIR.

As described above, excavation at the Kaufman site and hauling material from that location would not reduce Phase 3 TAC emissions and this impact would remain significant but would not be substantially more severe. SAFCA would continue to implement the existing, required mitigation measures from the Phase 3 EIR; however, air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, no new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section addresses potential hazards related to extracting and transporting levee construction material from the Kaufman site to active construction sites in the Basin. Because the Kaufman site is a newly identified source of material, it was not evaluated during the borrow site assessment completed for the 2009 Phase 3 EIR (Kleinfelder 2009). Therefore, SAFCA completed a Phase I environmental site assessment (ESA) (AECOM 2017) including a detailed records search, mapping review, and site reconnaissance to determine the potential to encounter contaminated soils or other potential sources of contamination.

The 2009 Phase 3 EIR evaluated the potential risks of encountering contaminated soil and the environmental effects of transporting contaminated soil to appropriate disposal sites. It noted that many of the borrow sites had been used for agriculture and that the soils could contain residual levels of pesticides, herbicides, and potentially asbestos from irrigation pipelines. The EIR identified specific sites around the basin with the potential for underground storage tanks, solid waste, abandoned wells, and other conditions.

Because similar hazards could be encountered at the Kaufman site, SAFCA would comply with 2009 Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.18-b(2): "Complete Investigations Related to the Extent to Which Soil and/or Groundwater May Have Been Contaminated in Areas Not Covered by the Phase I and II ESAs and Implement Required Measures." That previously adopted mitigation measure requires SAFCA to conduct Phase I ESAs, and if necessary, Phase II ESAs, and to implement any recommendations before initiating ground-disturbing activities, which include planning and implementing cleanup activities in coordination with the appropriate regulatory agencies. Accordingly, SAFCA completed a Phase I ESA for the Kaufman site and identified only one recognized environmental condition—a groundwater well pump that had leaked oil onto surface soil. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.18-b(2), SAFCA would determine the extent of contamination and dispose of any contaminated soils prior to excavation.

As with the Brookfield and Krumenacher sites, transporting material from the Kaufman site to levee construction sites around the Basin would result in construction trips and could interfere with evacuation routes. However, SAFCA would continue to implement the previously adopted Phase 3 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.18-c, "*Notify State and Local Emergency Management Agencies about Project Construction and Coordinate Any SR 99 Detours with these Agencies to Ensure That Any Need for Emergency Use Is Not Significantly Impaired.*" This measure requires notification of State and local emergency management agencies about project construction, particularly any SR 99 detours that could interfere with evacuation. SAFCA plans to use most of the Kaufman site material during construction of levees on the east side of the basin (Reaches E, F, and G) and most trucks would not need to cross or use SR 99. However, some of the material from the Kaufman site could be transported to the south (Reach A) and west (Reach B). SAFCA would continue to comply with the existing, required mitigation.

Although there are no schools near the Kaufman site, transport of contaminated soils, if discovered, could occur throughout the region. Therefore, SAFCA would continue to comply with Mitigation Measure 4.18-d: "*Notify the Twin Rivers Unified School District and Applicable Schools with Jurisdiction within One-Quarter Mile of Project Construction Activities.*" This previously adopted measure requires notification of the Twin Rivers Unified School District (and other jurisdictions) if hazardous wastes will be handled within ¹/₄ mile of a school. However, as described above, the Phase I ESA for the Kaufman site identified only one localized source of contaminated soils, which would be remediated before ground-disturbing activities.

As described above, excavation at the Kaufman site and hauling material from that location could increase hazards from exposure to contaminants. However, continuing to comply with the existing, required mitigation measures from the 2009 Phase 3 EIR would reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level. No new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

Noise

Construction noise would be generated by excavation equipment operating at the Kaufman site and by haul truck traffic traveling along the selected haul routes. Potential vibration impacts were evaluated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR for borrow sites, material hauling, and levee construction. Because only the vibration impacts associated with pile driving were found to be significant, and because pile driving is not required for the Kaufman site, no new or substantially more severe vibration impacts would occur.

Given the rural/agricultural land uses surrounding the Kaufman site, typical ambient noise levels are quite low: at or below 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) energy-equivalent noise level (L_{eq}), 50 dBA L_{eq} , and 45 dBA L_{eq} during the daytime, evening, and nighttime hours, respectively. Sutter and Sacramento counties and the City of Sacramento have nontransportation noise standards based on time of day and land use sensitivity or provide exemptions for daytime construction. Residential is the most noise-sensitive land use, and the most restrictive noise standards therefore apply. Temporary, short-term construction noise impacts are considered significant if noise levels would exceed the applicable standards and the ambient noise at nearby noise-sensitive land uses.

Noise generated by transportation sources are also regulated according to land use. All the jurisdictions with standards for transportation noise impacts have adopted a normally acceptable day-night average noise level (L_{dn}) /community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise standard of 60 dBA for residential land uses and a conditionally acceptable L_{dn} /CNEL noise standard of 65 dBA, provided that the best available noise reduction measures have been applied.

This analysis uses the significance thresholds used in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, which have not changed. Therefore, for residential land uses, haul truck noise was considered significant if it would cause overall exterior noise levels to exceed 60 dBA L_{dn} /CNEL or the interior noise standard of 45 dBA L_{dn} /CNEL in any inhabitable residence. It also uses the California Department of Transportation's standard of 0.2 inch per second peak particle velocity for preventing structural damage for normal buildings (Caltrans 2013) and the Federal Transit Administration's maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration decibels for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) (FTA 2006).

Excavation and loading of material at the Kaufman site would generate noise levels of approximately 76 dB L_{eq} at 100 feet, as determined in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR for typical borrow sites (see Phase 3 EIR Table 4.14-3). The nearest residential uses to the Kaufman site are within 100 feet of the southwest corner of the site, and within 500 feet of the eastern edge of the site. As described in the Phase 3 EIR, construction would be limited to between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Sundays.

Assuming a standard exterior-to-interior attenuation rate of 25 dBA for typical residential buildings with doors and windows closed, excavating and loading soil could exceed the Sutter County interior noise standard of 45 dBA L_{dn} /CNEL for the residence within 100 feet. The interior noise standard would not be exceeded at the residence located 500 feet to the east. Furthermore, if construction schedule constraints require an extended

workday, site development (excavation) could result in sleep disturbance at the residence located within 100 feet. Therefore, as determined for other borrow sites evaluated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR (and the Phase 4a and 4b EIRs) where residential uses were similarly located within 100 feet, excavation at the Kaufman site would result in temporary, short-term noise levels that exceed daytime and potentially nighttime standards. This would be a significant noise impact.

SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measure 4.14-a, "*Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices, Prepare a Noise Control Plan, and Monitor and Record Construction Noise Near Sensitive Receptors.*" These measures would be used to reduce excavation and material loading noise at the adjacent residence to the extent practicable, particularly when equipment is operating in the southwest portion of the Kaufman site, and would include requiring noise-reduction devices, limiting the use of alarms, and notifying residences. Beyond these standard measures, SAFCA would require the construction contractor to prepare and implement a noise control plan, conduct noise monitoring, and install noise-attenuating buffers ("structures, truck trailers, or soil piles") specifically designed to reduce noise at the adjacent residence on Sankey Road. This measure would require coordination with the adjacent property owner regarding noise measurements and installing structures such as temporary sound barriers. These measures would reduce noise impacts; however, because of the close proximity of the adjacent residence, noise levels may not be reduced to below significance thresholds and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Hauling material from the Kaufman site to active levee construction sites would generate 100–200 daily truck trips on the selected routes. Truck traffic noise levels were estimated in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR at 64 dB L_{eq} to 67 dB L_{eq} at 50 feet from the roadway centerline using the Federal Highway Administration's Federal Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA 1978) (see Phase 3 EIR Table 4.14-5).

As described in the project description, haul trucks would avoid the previously approved "off-road" levee haul route and several miles of residential uses in the northern part of the Basin along Garden Highway. Instead, they would select roads with primarily agricultural and industrial land uses, such as Sankey Road and West Elverta Road. As described in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, because these roadways currently serve limited traffic volumes, haul trucks would result in a substantial noise increase and residences located along Sankey Road, Powerline Road, and West Elverta Road, and Natomas Road and East Levee Road would experience an increase in traffic noise levels. The nearest residential land uses are located 50–100 feet from the roadway centerline and haul truck noise levels would be approximately 64–67 dB L_{eq} . Assuming a standard exterior-to-interior attenuation rate of 25 dBA for residential buildings, noise generated by haul trucks supplying material for Reaches B, E, F, and G could result in interior noise levels of 39–42 dB L_{eq} , which are below area interior noise standards. However, as described for excavation noise, daytime haul truck noise of 64–67 dB L_{eq} would exceed local exterior noise standards and could exceed standards at other times of the day if schedule constraints require extended hours to complete work within construction windows (i.e., the dry season). This temporary, short-term impact is considered potentially significant.

SAFCA would continue to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measure 4.14-c, "*Implement Noise-Reduction Measures to Reduce the Temporary, Short-term Impacts of Haul Truck Traffic Noise.*" These measures require noise-control devices on trucks and notification of affected residents. These measures would reduce interior and exterior noise levels; however, as was determined in the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, haul truck noise would still exceed exterior noise standards for residences and this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

As described above, excavation at the Kaufman site and hauling material from that location would result in noise that could exceed exterior and interior noise standards at the residence located within 100 feet of the site. SAFCA would continue to implement the existing, required mitigation measures from the 2009 Phase 3 EIR, including noise monitoring and using noise-attenuating buffers specifically designed to reduce noise at the adjacent residence on Sankey Road. This measure would require coordination with the adjacent property owner regarding noise measurements and installing structures such as temporary sound barriers. These measures would reduce noise impacts; however, because of the close proximity of the adjacent residence, noise levels may not be reduced to below significance thresholds and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Haul trucks may also

exceed exterior noise standards at this and other residences and SAFCA would continue to implement the existing, required mitigation measures to reduce truck noise. However, haul truck noise would still exceed exterior noise standards for residences and this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, no new or substantially increased significant environmental effects would occur and no new or revised mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed changes in the Phase 3 Project analyzed in this addendum would not require major revisions to the Phase 3 EIR because no new or substantially more severe significant impacts would result. Furthermore, no changes in the circumstances under which the project changes would be undertaken would require major revisions to the Phase 3 EIR because of new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects. In addition, no new information of substantial importance has been discovered that would trigger or require major revisions to the Phase 3 EIR because of new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects. No new mitigation measures, beyond those identified in the Phase 3 EIR would be required for the proposed project modifications. Therefore, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required before approval of the activities proposed in this addendum.

REFERENCES

- AECOM. 2017. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Kaufman Borrow Site, Parcels 35-150-006 and 35-160-006. Pleasant Grove, Sutter County, California 95668
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2017a. California Important Farmland Finder. <u>http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html</u>. Accessed on April 26, 2017.

—. 2017b). Williamson Act parcel mapping. Available at: <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Sutter 15 16 WA.pdf</u>. Accessed on May 11, 2017.

- California Department of Transportation. 2013 (September). Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. Sacramento, CA.
- City of Sacramento. 2016 (August). Bike Master Plan, City of Sacramento.
- California Native Plant Society. 2017. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-02). Sacramento, CA. Available: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org. Accessed March 28, 2017.
- California Natural Diversity Database. 2017. Results of electronic record search. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch. Sacramento, CA.
- Caltrans. See California Department of Transportation.
- CNDDB. See California Natural Diversity Database.
- CNPS. See California Native Plant Society.
- Federal Highway Administration and U.S. Department of Transportation. 1978 (December). Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. FHWA-RD-77-108. Washington, DC.
- Federal Transit Administration. 2006 (May). Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA-VA-90-1003-06. Office of Planning and Environment, Washington, DC.

FHWA. See Federal Highway Administration.

- FTA. See Federal Transit Administration.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers. 1988 (August). Traffic Access and Impact Studies for Site Development. Transportation Planners Council. Washington, DC.
- ITE. See Institute of Transportation Engineers.
- Kleinfelder. 2009. (July 20). Initial Site Survey, DJKM Trust Property, APN 35-160-006/PG1, Sankey Road, Sutter County, California.
- Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA). 2007a (February). *Final Environmental Impact Report on Local Funding Mechanisms for Comprehensive Flood Control Improvements for the Sacramento Area.* State Clearinghouse No. 2006072098. Sacramento, CA. Prepared by EDAW, Sacramento, CA.

- ———. 2009b (May). Final Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project. State Clearinghouse No. 2007062016. Sacramento, CA. Prepared by EDAW, Sacramento, CA.
- ———. 2011 (February). Addendum No. 1 to the Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 4a Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento, CA.
- ------. 2012a (April). Addendum No. 2 to the Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 4a Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento, CA.
- ———. 2012b (July). Addendum No. 3 to the Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 4a Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento, CA.
- ------. 2015 (March). Addendum No. 4 to the Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 4a Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento, CA.
- ——. 2017 (March). Coordinated Strategy for Meeting Borrow and Mitigation Needs. Common Features Project, Natomas Basin Project. Draft.
- SAFCA. See Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency.
- USACE. See U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- USACE and SAFCA. See U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2009 (August 21). Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento District, Sacramento, CA. Prepared by EDAW | AECOM, Sacramento, CA.
 - ——. 2010 (February 19). *Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Phase 4a Landside Improvements Project*. Sacramento District, Sacramento, CA. Prepared by AECOM, Sacramento, CA.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. 2009 (February 13). Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 3 Landside Improvements Project. State Clearinghouse No. 2008072060. Sacramento, CA. Prepared by EDAW, Sacramento, CA.
 - ——. 2010 (October 22). Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report on the American River Watershed Common Features Project/Natomas Post-authorization Change Report/Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Phase 4b Landside Improvements Project. Sacramento, CA. Prepared by AECOM, Sacramento, CA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017. Information for Planning and Conservation Trust Resource Report. Generated March 28, 2017.
- USFWS. See U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT 1

SAFCA Construction Phasing Map



ATTACHMENT 2

CEQA Checklist for Screening Subsequent Selection of Borrow Sites

ATTACHMENT 2

NLIP PHASE 3 EIR – CEQA CHECKLIST FOR SCREENING SUBSEQUENT SELECTION OF BORROW SITES

The following checklist was developed as part of the NLIP Phase 3 EIR (Appendix J) to assist with determining whether subsequent project-related activities will require further environmental documentation. The checklist was originally developed with the intent of evaluating additional sites within the Elkhorn Borrow Area; however, the checklist addresses all required CEQA resources areas and SAFCA has used this checklist to determine whether use of the Kaufman site as a borrow area has been evaluated at a sufficient level of detail and undergone the appropriate level of CEQA review.

The checklist involves a three-step process for determining whether a specific borrow site has been sufficiently analyzed, or if the use of the borrow site would require preparation of a new CEQA compliance document. The following three-step process was outlined in the Phase 3 EIR.

- 1. SAFCA will review the impacts that were identified as "less than significant" in the checklist below and fill out the checklist accordingly. If the use of the borrow site would contribute to these impacts, SAFCA will determine whether the contribution of borrow site operations would result in a significant impact. If a new significant impact would result, a supplemental or subsequent EIR will be required and prepared.
- 2. For impacts that the checklist shows previously analyzed and disclosed as "significant," and for which SAFCA identified and adopted mitigation measures that would reduce those impacts to less-than-significant levels, SAFCA will determine whether the borrow site operations would contribute to those impacts. If the borrow site operations contribute to those impacts, but implementation of the mitigation measures and environmental commitments identified in the 2007 Landside EIR (SAFCA 2007) and this Phase 3 EIS/EIR, which were previously adopted and incorporated into the project, would mitigate that contribution to a less-than-significant level, the borrow site's contribution to those impacts will not trigger the need to prepare a new CEQA compliance document. If the use of the borrow site would cause these impacts to become significant impacts even after implementation of identified mitigation, SAFCA will prepare the appropriate CEQA compliance document, as described above.

SAFCA will also use the checklist to determine if the borrow site operations would contribute to identified significant and unavoidable impacts. If the borrow site operations cause or contribute to any of the previously analyzed and disclosed significant or potentially significant and unavoidable impacts, SAFCA will determine if the borrow site's contribution was included when calculating the severity of the impact. If the borrow site's contribution to that impact was included in the impacts previously analyzed in this Phase 3 EIS/EIR or the 2007 Landside EIR, no new CEQA compliance document will be required. If the borrow site's contribution was not included in the impacts analyzed in this Phase 3 EIS/EIR or the 2007 Landside EIR, a new EIR, EIR addendum, or potentially a mitigated negative declaration will be required and prepared.

3. SAFCA will use the checklist to determine if the use of the borrow site would result in new impacts that were not previously disclosed in this Phase 3 EIS/EIR or the 2007 Landside EIR, or would affect resources that were not identified when analyzing previously disclosed impacts. If so, SAFCA will prepare the appropriate CEQA compliance document, as described above.

Kaufman Borrow Area Checklist				
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING				
Designated borrow site APN(s) :35-150-006, 35-160-006				
Land use types within designated borrow site Information from surveys:				
Does the site include:	Does the site include:			
Developed land	Cultural Resources			
Agricultural land	⊠ Wetlands			
Orchards	Special-Status Species			
Grassland	Suitable Habitat for Special-Status Species			
Non-Riparian Woodlands	Recognized Environmental Conditions			
Riparian Woodland/Scrub	-			
Williamson Act Land (in a preserve or under contract)				

Impacts Identified as "Less Than Significant"			
Issue Area	Impact	Would the use of the borrow site result in any of the identified impacts, and if so would the impact be considered less than significant without mitigation?	
Land Use, Socioeconomics, and Population and Housing	Impact 4.2-a: Inconsistency with Airport Master Plan, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Plans	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Hydrology and	Impact 4.4-a: Hydraulic Impacts on Other Areas and Exposure to Flood Risk	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Hydraulics	Impact 4.4-c: Effects on Groundwater	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Cultural ResourcesImpact 4.10-b: Potential Changes to Other Known Historic-Era Resources from Ground Disturbance or Other Construction-Related Activities		Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Air Quality	Impact 4.13-b: General Conformity with the Applicable Air Quality Plan	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌	
	Impact 4.13-c: Long-Term Changes in Emissions of ROG, NO _X , and PM ₁₀ Associated with Project Implementation	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
	Impact 4.13-d: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Emissions	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Noise	Impact 4.14-d: Long-Term Increases in Project- Generated Noise	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Noise	Impact 4.14-e: Exposure of People Working in the Project Area to Excessive Airport Noise Levels	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	
Utilities and Service Systems Impact 4.17-c: Increases in Solid Waste Generation		Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact 4.18-a: Accidental Spills of Hazardous Materials		Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌	
Airport SafetyImpact 4.19-b: Potential for Higher Frequency of Collisions between Aircraft and Wildlife at Sacramento International Airport		Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌	

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
Land Use, Socioeconomics, and Population and Housing	Impact 4.2-b: Inconsistency with the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan	Mitigation Measure 4.2-b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-h, "Ensure that Project Encroachment Does Not Jeopardize Successful Implementation of the NBHCP and Implement Mitigation Measures 4.7-a, 4.8-a, and 4.9-a through 4.9-g"	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Geology and Soils	Impact 4.3-a: Potential Temporary and Permanent Localized Soil Erosion during Construction and Operation	Mitigation Measure 4.3-a(1): Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-a, "Implement Standard Best Management Practices, Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Comply With National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Conditions" Mitigation Measure 4.3-a(2): Secure and Implement the Conditions of the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Permit	Not Applicable □ Yes ⊠ No □
Hydrology and Hydraulics	Impact 4.4-b: Alteration of Local Drainage	Mitigation Measure 4.4-b: Coordinate with Landowners and Drainage Infrastructure Operators, Prepare Final Drainage Studies as Needed, and Implement Proper Project Design	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Water Quality	Impact 4.5-a: Temporary Impacts on Water Quality from Stormwater Runoff, Erosion, or Spills	Mitigation Measure 4.5-a: Implement Standard Best Management Practices, Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Conditions	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
Fish and Aquatic Habitat	Impact 4.6-a: Loss of Fish or Aquatic Habitat through Increased Sedimentation and Turbidity or Releases of Contaminants	Mitigation Measure 4.6-a: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-a, "Implement Standard Best Management Practices, Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Conditions"; and Mitigation Measure 4.5-c, "Implement Best Management Practices and Comply with NPDES Permit Conditions for a Point-Source Discharge"	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌
Sensitive Aquatic Habitats	Impact 4.7-a: Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters of the United States	Mitigation Measure 4.7-a: Minimize Effects on Jurisdictional Waters of the United States, Complete Detailed Design of Habitat Creation Components and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation of Waters Filled, and Comply with Section 404, Section 401, Section 10, and Section 1602, Permit Processes	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Vegetation and Wildlife	Impact 4.8-a: Loss of Woodland Habitats	Mitigation Measure 4.8-a: Minimize Effects on Woodland Habitat, Complete Detailed Design of Woodland Creation and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation for Loss of Habitat, Implement all Management Agreements, and Comply with the DFG Section 1602 Permit Process	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
	Impact 4.8-b: Impacts on Wildlife Corridors	Mitigation Measure 4.8-b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-a, "Minimize Effects on Woodland Habitat, Complete Detailed Design of Woodland Creation and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation for Loss of Quantity and Quality of Habitat, Implement all Agreements, and Comply with the DFG Section 1602 Permit Process," and Mitigation Measure 4.9-c, "Minimize the Potential for Direct Loss of Giant Garter Snake Individuals, Develop Detailed Design of Managed Marsh and New Canals and Management Agreements to Ensure Adequate Compensation for Loss of Habitat, Implement all Management Agreements, and Obtain Incidental Take Authorization"	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
	Impact 4.9-a: Impacts on Special-Status Plants Species	Mitigation Measure 4.9-a: Conduct Focused Surveys for Special-Status Plants, Minimize Effects, and Develop Detailed Design of Created Habitat and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation for Loss of Habitat, and Implement all Management Agreements	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌
Special-Status Terrestrial Species	Impact 4.9-b: Impacts on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle	Mitigation Measure 4.9-b: Conduct Focused Surveys for Elderberry Shrubs as Needed, Complete Detailed Design of Woodland/Elderberry Habitat and Management Agreements to Ensure Adequate Compensation for Loss of Shrubs, Implement all Management Agreements, and Obtain Incidental Take Authorization	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
	Impact 4.9-c: Impacts on Giant Garter Snake Related to Construction Activities	Mitigation Measure 4.9-c: Minimize the Potential for Direct Loss of Giant Garter Snake Individuals, Develop Detailed Design of Managed Marsh and New Canals and Management Agreements to Ensure Adequate Compensation for Loss of Habitat, Implement all Management Agreements, and Obtain Incidental Take Authorization	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌
	Impact 4.9-e: Impacts on Northwestern Pond Turtle	Mitigation Measure 4.9-e: Conduct Focused Surveys for Northwestern Pond Turtles and Relocate Turtles, if Needed	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
	Impact 4.9-g: Impacts on Burrowing Owl	Mitigation Measure 4.9-g: Minimize Potential Impacts on Burrowing Owls and Relocate Owls as Needed	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌
	Impact 4.9-h: Impacts on Successful Implementation of the NBHCP	Mitigation Measure 4.9-h: Ensure that Project Encroachment Does Not Jeopardize Successful Implementation of the NBHCP and Implement Mitigation Measures 4.7-a, 4.8-a, and 4.9-a through 4.9-g	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Paleontological Resources	Impact 4.11-a: Disturbance of Unknown Unique Paleontological Resources during Earthmoving Activities	Mitigation Measure 4.11-a: Conduct Construction Personnel Training and, if Paleontological Resources Are Found, Stop Work Near the Find and Implement Mitigation in Coordination with a Professional Paleontologist	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
Transportation and Circulation	Impact 4.12-b: Temporary Increase in Traffic Hazards on Local Roadways	Mitigation Measure 4.12-b: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan and Implement Measures to Avoid and Minimize Traffic Hazards on Local Roadways during and after Construction	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🗌 No 🔀
	Impact 4.12-c: Temporary Disruption of Emergency Service Response Times and Access	Mitigation Measure 4.12-c: Notify Emergency Service Providers about Project Construction and Maintain Emergency Access or Coordinate Detours with Providers	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
Recreation	Impact 4.15-a: Long- Term Disruption of Recreational Activities and Facilities	Mitigation Measure 4.15-a: Prepare and Implement a Bicycle Detour Plan for Ueda Trail, Provide Construction Period Information on Recreational Facility Closures and Detours, Provide Detours for Bicycle Facilities, and Repair Damage to Recreational Facilities	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
	Impact 4.15-b: Temporary Changes in Recreational Opportunities during Project Construction Activities	Mitigation Measure 4.15-b: Provide Construction Period Information on Recreational Facility Closures and Detours and: Provide Detours for Access Routes to Boat Launch Ramps and Marinas	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Utilities and Service Systems	Impact 4.17-a: Potential Temporary Disruption of Irrigation Water Supply	Mitigation Measure 4.17-a: Coordinate with Irrigation Water Supply Users Before and During All Irrigation Infrastructure Modifications and Minimize Interruptions of Supply	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
	Impact 4.17-b: Potential Disruption of Utility Service	Mitigation Measure 4.17-b: Verify Utility Locations, Coordinate with Utility Providers, Prepare and Implement a Response Plan, and Conduct Worker Training with Respect to Accidental Utility Damage	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Impact 4.18-b: Exposure to Hazardous Materials Encountered at Project Sites	Mitigation Measure 4.18-b(1): Complete Recommendations Included in Phase I and/or II ESAs and Implement Required Measures Mitigation Measure 4.18-b(2): Complete Investigations Related to the Extent to Which Soil and/or Groundwater May Have Been Contaminated in Areas Not Covered by the Phase I and II ESAs and Implement Required Measures	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🛛 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Less than Significant" after Mitigation Implementation			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	Would the use of the borrow site result in significant impacts, and would the application of identified mitigation reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level?
	Impact 4.18-c: Interference with an Adopted Emergency Evacuation Plan	Mitigation Measure 4.18-c: Notify State and Local Emergency Management Agencies about Project Construction and Coordinate SR 99/70 Detours with these Agencies to Ensure That Any Need for Emergency Use Is Not Significantly Impaired	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
	Impact 4.18-d: Hazardous Emissions or Handling of Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School	Mitigation Measure 4.18-d: Notify the Twin Rivers Unified School District and Applicable School with Jurisdiction within One-Quarter Mile of Project Construction Activities.	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🗌
Airport Safety	Impact 4.19-a: Temporary Aircraft Safety Hazards Resulting from Project Construction Activities within or near the Airport Critical Zone	Mitigation Measure 4.19-a: Coordinate Work in the Critical Zone with Airport Operations and Restrict Night Lighting within and near the Runway Approaches	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Wildfire Hazards	Impact 4.20-a: Potential Exposure to Wildland Fires	Mitigation Measure 4.20-a: Prepare and Implement a Fire Management Plan to Minimize Potential for Wildland Fires	Not Applicable 🔀 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Environmental Justice	Impact 4.21-a: Potential to Have a Disproportionate High Adverse Environmental Impact on any Minority or Low-Income Populations	Mitigation Measure 4.21-a: Increase the Direct Benefits of the Project for the Ancestors of the Native American Tribes	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌

Impacts Identified as "Significant and Unavoidable"			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	After implementation of mitigation (if available), would the level of severity/intensity be equal to or less than as described in the Phase 3 Project EIS/EIR? Was the borrow sites' contribution to this impact identified in a previous document (if relevant)?
Agricultural Resources	Impact 4.1-a: Conversion of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Uses	Mitigation Measure 4.1-a: Minimize Important Farmland Conversion to the Extent Practicable and Feasible	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🖾
	Impact 4.1-b: Conflict with Lands under Williamson Act Contracts	Mitigation Measure 4.1-b: Minimize Impacts on Agricultural Preserve Land and Williamson Act-Contracted Land; Comply with Government Code Sections 51290-51293; and Coordinate with Landowners and Agricultural Operators	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Land Use, Socioeconomics, and Population and Housing	Impact 4.2-c: Potential to Physically Divide or Disrupt an Established Community	Mitigation Measure 4.2-c: Notify Residents and Businesses of Project Construction and Road Closure Schedule, Provide Assistance for Temporary Relocation of Residents, Negotiate with Businesses, and Provide Security for Vacated Residence and Businesses; and Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12- a, "Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction-Related Truck Trips," and Mitigation Measure 4.12-c, "Notify Emergency Service Providers about Project Construction and Maintain Emergency Access or Coordinate Detours with Providers"	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Special-Status Terrestrial Species	Impact 4.9-f: Impacts on Swainson's Hawk and Other Special- Status Birds	Mitigation Measure 4.9-f: Minimize Potential Impacts on Swainson's Hawk and Other Special-Status Birds Foraging and Nesting Habitat, Monitor Active Nests during Construction, Develop and Implement a Management Plan in Consultation with DFG, Obtain Incidental Take Authorization, and Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-a, "Minimize Effects on Woodland Habitat, Complete Detailed Design of Woodland Creation and Management Agreements to Ensure Compensation for Loss of Quantity and Quality of Habitat, Implement all Agreements, and Comply with the DFG Section 1602 Permit Process"	Not Applicable □ Yes ⊠ No □

Impacts Identified as "Significant and Unavoidable"			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	After implementation of mitigation (if available), would the level of severity/intensity be equal to or less than as described in the Phase 3 Project EIS/EIR? Was the borrow sites' contribution to this impact identified in a previous document (if relevant)?
Cultural Resources	Impact 4.10-c: Potential Damage or Disturbance to Known Prehistoric Resources from Ground- Disturbance or Other Construction-Related Activities	Mitigation Measure 4.10-c: Avoid Ground Disturbance Near Eligible and Listed Resources to the Extent Feasible, Prepare a Finding of Effect, and Resolve Any Adverse Effects through Preparation of an HPTP	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
	Impact 4.10-d: Potential Damage to or Destruction of Previously Undiscovered Cultural Resources from Ground-Disturbance or Other Construction- Related Activities	Mitigation Measure 4.10-d: Train Construction Workers Before Construction, Monitor Construction Activities, Stop Potentially Damaging Activities, Evaluate Discovery(ies), Resolve Adverse Effects on Eligible Resources, if Encountered, and Conduct Additional Backhoe and Canine Forensic Investigations as Appropriate	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🖾
	Impact 4.10-e: Potential Discovery of Human Remains during Construction	Mitigation Measure 4.10-e: Stop Work Within An Appropriate Radius Around the Find, Notify the Applicable County Coroner and Most Likely Descendant, and Treat Remains in Accordance with Measures Stipulated in an HPTP Developed in Consultation between USACE, SAFCA, and the SHPO	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🔀
Transportation and Circulation	Impact 4.12-a: Temporary Increase in Traffic on Local Roadways	Mitigation Measure 4.12-a: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Safety and Control Plan for Construction- Related Truck Trips	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🖾 No 🖾
Air Quality	Impact 4.13-a: Temporary Emissions of ROG, NO_X , and PM_{10} during Construction	Mitigation Measure 4.13-a: Implement Applicable District- Recommended Control Measures to Minimize Temporary Emissions of ROG, NO _X , and PM ₁₀ during Construction	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🔀

Impacts Identified as "Significant and Unavoidable"			
Issue Area	Impact	Mitigation Measure	After implementation of mitigation (if available), would the level of severity/intensity be equal to or less than as described in the Phase 3 Project EIS/EIR? Was the borrow sites' contribution to this impact identified in a previous document (if relevant)?
Noise	Impact 4.14-a: Generation of Temporary, Short- Term Construction Noise	Mitigation Measure 4.14-a: Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices, Prepare a Noise Control Plan, and Monitor and Record Construction Noise Near Sensitive Receptors	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🔀 No 🔀
	Impact 4.14-b: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to or Generation of Excessive Groundborne Vibration	Mitigation Measure 4.14-b: Implement Measures to Avoid Construction-Related Vibration Effects at the Pumping Plant No. 2 Site	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
	Impact 4.14-c: Temporary, Short- Term Exposure of Residents to Increased Traffic Noise Levels from Hauling Activity	Mitigation Measure 4.14-c: Implement Noise-Reduction Measures to Reduce the Temporary, Short-Term Impacts of Haul Truck Traffic Noise	Not Applicable 🗌 Yes 🛛 No 🔀
Visual Resources	Impact 4.16-a: Alteration of Scenic Vistas, Scenic Resources, and Existing Visual Character of the Project Area	Mitigation Measure 4.16-a: Screen Residential Areas from Construction Storage and Staging Areas; Provide Screening of Construction Sites on the Levee for Residential Areas	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌
	Impact 4.16-b: New Sources of Light and Glare that Adversely Affect Views	Mitigation Measure 4.16-b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.16-a, "Screen Residential Areas from Construction Storage and Staging Areas; Provide Screening of Construction Sites on the Levee for Residential Areas," and Mitigation Measure 4.19-a, "Coordinate Work in the Critical Zone with Airport Operations and Restrict Night Lighting within and near the Runway Approaches;" and Direct Lighting Away from Adjacent Properties.	Not Applicable 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌

CHECKLIST SUMMARY	
Are there new significant impacts in addition to those discussed above? If yes, describe using an attachment to this checklist.	Yes 🗌 No 🔀
Are there significant impacts discussed above that are substantially more severe than discussed in the Phase 3 Project EIS/EIR? If yes, explain on an attachment to this checklist.	Yes 🗌 No 🔀
Are there significant impacts discussed in the 2007 Landside EIR (program level) that are substantially more severe than previously disclosed? If yes, explain on an attachment to this checklist.	
Are additional mitigation measures or alternatives? Are they feasible or considerably different from the previously adopted mitigation measures? If yes, explain on an attachment to this checklist.	Yes 🗌 No 🔀
Is additional environmental documentation required? If yes, specify type of environmental compliance document required: EIR Addendum Mitigation Negative Declaration Supplemental EIR Subsequent EIR Supplemental EIS	Yes │ No │ Yes │ No │

This page intentionally left blank.