

Folsom Cordova Unified School District
945 RILEY STREET
FOLSOM, CA 95630
TELEPHONE: (916) 355-1100 FAX: (916) 294-0725
WWW.FCUSD.ORG

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

FOR FOLSOM CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT EDUCATION SERVICES CENTER

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act. For the grading permits associated with this project, the Sacramento County **Control Number is 2009-70047**.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
1. LAND USE - Would the project:				
a. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	The project is consistent with environmental policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, Sacramento County Zoning Code, and Aerojet SPA.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?			X	The project will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community.
2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?			X	The project does not propose new unplanned homes, businesses, or extension of infrastructure.
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	The project will not result in the removal of existing housing.
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?			X	The project site is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, nor does it contain prime soils.
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?			X	No Williamson Act contracts apply to the project site.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?			X	The project does not occur in an area of agricultural production.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?			X	The project does not occur in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.
b. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	Given the urbanized environment in which the project is proposed, the project would not substantially alter the visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity. However, it is acknowledged that aesthetic impacts are subjective and may be perceived differently by various affected individuals.
c. Create a new source of substantial light, glare or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	The project would not result in substantial new sources of light, glare or shadow.
5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:				
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?			X	The project is near Mather Airport, but is outside any identified safety zone.
b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?			X	The project is near Mather Airport, but is outside any identified noise contour.
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?			X	The project does not affect navigable airspace.
d. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?			X	The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.
6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:				
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?			X	The water needs of the project are small. There is adequate water supply to support this office building project.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?			X	The project will be required to connect to a public sewer system. The public sewer system in the project area has adequate capacity to serve the project.
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	The Sacramento County Integrated Waste Management Plan provides for adequate waste disposal capacity to serve existing and anticipated development until the year 2010. The Keifer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2030.
d. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?			X	There is adequate capacity to serve the project. Minor extension of water/sewer lines would be necessary.
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?		X		The project includes the construction of a detention basin and swale to serve the project. The construction of these facilities will result in impacts to biological resources that require mitigation. See Section 12.
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?			X	Sacramento Municipal Utility District provides electricity in the project area, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company provides natural gas service. Both utilities have adequate supply for the project. Only minor extension of lines will be necessary.
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?			X	Project would incrementally increase demand for emergency services. However, no substantial adverse physical impacts have been identified.
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?			X	The project will not require the use of public school services.
i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?			X	The project will not affect the provision of park services.
7. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
a. Result in a substantial increase in peak hour vehicle trip-ends that could exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?			X	Project traffic was addressed comprehensively as part of the adjacent Easton project (04-0035).
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?			X	Project access would be from Alabama Avenue and Atlanta Street. There are no substantial adverse impacts associated with this access design.
c. Result in substantial adverse impact due to inadequate parking capacity?			X	The project includes 265 parking spaces, which is adequate to serve the needs of the building.
d. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?			X	Access and roadway improvements associated with the project will not substantially affect public safety on area roadways.
e. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	No conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation have been identified.
8. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:				
a. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	The project site is small enough to fall below the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?			X	The project will not expose sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, nursing homes, hospitals, daycare centers, etc.) to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards.
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	Objectionable odors are not expected from the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
9. NOISE - Would the project:				
a. Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.
b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			X	Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact is considered less than significant due to the temporary nature of these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?			X	The project will not substantially increase water demand.
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	Compliance with applicable requirements of the County Floodplain Management Ordinance, County Drainage Ordinance, and Improvement Standards will ensure impacts are less than significant.
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?			X	The project is not within a FEMA 100-year floodplain. Compliance with the County Floodplain Management Ordinance, County Drainage Ordinance, and Improvement Standards will assure less than significant impacts.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?			X	The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain.
e. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	The project will not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
f. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X	The project will not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
g. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			X	Sacramento County has been issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permit by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board which requires the County to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable. The County complies with this permit by developing and enforcing ordinances and requirements to reduce the discharge of sediments and other pollutants in runoff from newly developing and redeveloping areas of the County. These requirements apply to the project, and will ensure less than significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?			X	Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will assure less than significant impacts.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?			X	Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?			X	The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit.
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?			X	A public sewer system is available to serve the project.
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?			X	The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located on the project site.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?			X	No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species?		X		The project area contains potential habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and for special status branchiopods (habitat is located within on-site wetlands). A biological opinion has been completed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service stating that compliance with recommended mitigation will ensure that impacts are not significant.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community?			X	The project is within the vicinity of riparian habitat, but will not have substantial impacts on the habitat. Refer to the sections on wetlands, native trees, and special status species for other impacts.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands designated as jurisdictional waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act?			X	The project will not result in direct impacts, but may result in indirect impacts due to stockpiling in close proximity to wetlands. Indirect impacts are not covered under Section 404. Refer to 12.a.
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?			X	Resident and/or migratory wildlife may be displaced by project construction. However, impacts are not anticipated to result in significant, long-term effects upon the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?		X		The project will result in the removal of a substantial amount of native oak trees and California black walnut. Mitigation is included to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?			X	The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources.
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?			X	There are no known conflicts with any approved plan for the conservation of habitat.
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource?			X	No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant ⁱ	Less Than Significant with Mitigation ⁱⁱ	Less Than Significant or No Impact ⁱⁱⁱ	Comments
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?		X		Although no known archaeological resources occur on-site, the site is within an area where resources have been discovered. Mitigation is included to ensure that if any subsurface resources is discovered during construction, that work will cease and the appropriate authorities will be notified.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains.
14. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?			X	The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	The project does not involve the use or handling of hazardous material.
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?			X	The project area was searched using the Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor system, and the State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker system. There are no toxic or hazardous sites listed on the project area. The greater Aeroject property to the east is listed, but that will not result in adverse affects to the project.
e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?			X	The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	Industrial Intensive, Industrial Extensive, Natural Preserve	X		
Community Plan	None			
Land Use Zone	Aerojet SPA	X		

-
- ⁱ **Potentially Significant** indicates there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant” entries and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
- ⁱⁱ **Less than Significant with Mitigation** applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.
- ⁱⁱⁱ **Less than Significant or No Impact** indicates that either a project will have an impact but the impact is considered minor or that a project does not impact the particular resource.