



NOTICE OF PREPARATION
of an Environmental Impact Report for the
Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project

Date: January 15, 2025
To: State Clearinghouse, Responsible and Trustee Agencies, and Interested Individuals and Organizations
Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project
Lead Agency: California Department of Parks and Recreation
PO Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001
Contact: Katie Metraux

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks), as the lead agency, is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project (proposed project). State Parks has prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP) pursuant to Section 15082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This NOP informs agencies and the public that an EIR is being prepared to address potential effects resulting from the approval and implementation of the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project. Publication of this NOP provides an opportunity for public comment on potential environmental effects to be addressed in the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project EIR. Additional information about the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan process is available at the project website: <https://plandeltameadows.com/>

Due to limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the close of the 30-day NOP review period at **5:00 p.m. on Friday, February 14, 2025**. If you submit comments on the scope of the EIR, you will automatically be added to the distribution list for future notices about the proposed project. Please include **"Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan EIR"** as the subject and submit comments via the mailing address listed above or email info@PlanDeltaMeadows.com. Please note that all submitted correspondence and comments become part of the public record.

SCOPING MEETING

State Parks will hold a **virtual** scoping meeting on at **6:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 30, 2025** to provide additional information about the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan and EIR process and give interested parties an opportunity to comment on the scope and potential environmental effects of the project to be analyzed in the EIR. The meeting can be attended remotely via the Zoom platform at the following link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87457219007?pwd=KMQxa7rKDci7jCw23jOFJ1bGlqcSX8.1>

Meeting ID: 874 5721 9007

Passcode: 896785

PROJECT LOCATION

The Delta Meadows Park Property is in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta near the communities of Walnut Grove and Locke, within State Parks' Diablo Range District. The property includes approximately 519 acres including portions of Snodgrass Slough. It also includes the historic Locke Boarding House, in nearby Locke. The boundary of the Delta Meadows property is shown in Figure 1, *Delta Meadows Park Boundary*. The Delta Meadows property is near River Road, approximately 2.7 miles west of Interstate 5 (I-5) and approximately 20 miles south of Sacramento.



PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A General Plan is the primary management document for each park unit within the State Park System and establishes the park unit's primary purpose and management direction. The Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project would result in a General Plan for the Delta Meadows property as it is converted into a State Park property. Additionally, the Delta Meadows property would be classified into either a State Recreation Area, State Park, State Historic Park, or State Reserve. These classifications come with varying levels of trail systems, interpretive activities, recreation, and overnight lodging. Areas within Delta Meadows could also be subclassified as a natural preserve or a cultural preserve. More information regarding each of these classifications and subclassifications is available at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PRC&division=5.&title=&part=&chapter=1.&article=1.7.

The General Plan will outline the long-term management framework for the property and, depending on the classification outcome, establish the foundation for future park improvements. The General Plan will be based on extensive resource and user information gathered during the planning effort. The General Plan will document existing conditions and establish goals and guidelines that will guide Delta Meadows property management and provide long-term direction for the development of future facilities. Where appropriate, the location and extent of potential future facilities will be determined, and associated effects analyzed in the EIR.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The programmatic EIR will determine whether implementation of the proposed project may result in environmental effects that require mitigation measures to offset potential effects. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate alternatives to a project that could reasonably attain the project objectives while reducing any significant effects of the project, as well as considering the "No Project" Alternative (i.e., what could happen if the project were not approved). The potential environmental effects that will be addressed in the Delta Meadows Park Classification and General Plan Project EIR include effects on the following resource areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in effects on aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and wildfire (see Attachment: *Environmental Factors Not Affected*, for reasons for dismissal from detailed analysis).



FIGURE 1 DELTA MEADOWS PARK BOUNDARY



Attachment: *Environmental Factors Not Affected*



This page has been intentionally left blank.

Attachment: Environmental Factors Not Affected

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study Checklist was prepared to identify environmental issues within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist Form*, that would not be affected by the proposed project. All other environmental issues within the CEQA checklist will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the proposed project.

I. AESTHETICS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape feature (e.g., a mountain range, lake, or coastline) or of a significant historic or architectural feature (e.g., views of a historic structure). Views of distant mountains and the site and surrounding area, which includes views of Snodgrass Slough and associated levees within the project site, are available to users of the project site. However, most views are currently limited due to the site topography and surrounding vegetation coverage as well as the structures in Locke and specifically those around the Locke Boarding House. The proposed project is a long-range planning document to guide the future operation and improvements to the Delta Meadows Park Property, which would build off the existing uses (trails, fishing, motorized, and non-motorized boating, and other low-impact activities) and would not include any large structures that would have the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

project would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The nearest State-designated scenic highway is State Route 160 (SR-160) which is across the Sacramento River approximately 0.1 miles west of the project site when measured from the historic Locke Boarding House. The remainder of the project site is not visible from SR-160. Locke is accessed from River Road, a County route and Locke Boarding House, a historic building, is on and visible from River Road. The proposed project would not change the overall visual character of Locke Boarding House. Accordingly, the proposed project would not substantially degrade scenic resources within a State scenic highway and a less-than-significant impact would occur. As such, this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- c) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project site is in a non-urbanized area. As described in the discussion of criterion (a), the implementation of the proposed project is a long-range planning document to guide the future operation and improvements to the Delta Meadows Park Property, which would build off the existing uses (trails, fishing, motorized, and non-motorized boating, and other low-impact activities). Accordingly, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Impacts to the visual character or quality of the project site would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- d) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Nighttime illumination and glare impacts are the effects of exterior lighting on adjoining uses and areas. Light reflecting off passing cars and large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows) or other reflective surfaces can generate glare. Excessive light and/or glare can impair vision, cause annoyance, affect sleep patterns, and generate safety hazards for drivers. Sources of light include streetlights, parking lot lighting, security lights, vehicular headlights, and reflective building surfaces and windows. The proposed project considers adding and/or updating infrastructure, efficiencies, and other low-impact recreation uses that would be limited to daytime use. No substantial lighting or other sources of glare which could incrementally increase light and glare in the area would be proposed. All outdoor lighting would comply with applicable lighting requirements in the California Building Standards Commission's California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11 [CALGreen]). CALGreen establishes building standards aimed at enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts that reduce negative impacts and increase positive environmental impacts by encouraging sustainable construction practices. Specifically, Section 5.106.8, Light Pollution Reduction, establishes backlight, uplight, and glare ratings to minimize the effects of light pollution for nonresidential development. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-e) **No Impact.** The project site does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance;¹ forest or timberland use zones or land uses;² or Williamson Act contracts.³ Accordingly, the proposed project would not have the potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest use; or conflict with zoning for agricultural, forestland, or timberland. Therefore, there would be no impact and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ California Department of Conservation, 2024, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed November 27, 2024.

² California Department of Conservation, 2024, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed November 27, 2024.

³ California Department of Conservation, 2024, California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/WilliamsonAct/>, accessed November 27, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?	■	□	□
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	□	□
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	□	■	□

DISCUSSION

a-c) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

d) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural operations, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and certain industrial operations such as chemical and other manufacturing. The proposed project would not introduce any new uses that would result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Accordingly, impacts associated with emissions such as those related to odor would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plan, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	■	□	□
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	■	□	□
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	■	□	□
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	■	□	□
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	■	□	□
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	■	□	□

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

DISCUSSION

a-f) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-c) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

VI. ENERGY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Construction of future park improvements would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels at levels typical of similar construction activities. Electricity and liquid fuels used during operation of the proposed park improvements would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant, and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project site is not on or near an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest mapped active fault—that is, a fault that has ruptured during Holocene time (the last 11,700 years)—is the Cordelia Fault of the Cordelia fault zone, which is approximately 34 miles west of the project site.⁴ Due to the distance to the active fault, the potential for surface rupture of a fault on-site is considered negligible. Additionally, the sizable distance from the Cordelia Fault decreases the chances that the proposed project would experience strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, the project site is not at a greater risk of seismic activity or impacts than other sites in northern California. The State regulates development in California through a variety of tools that reduce hazards from earthquakes and other geologic phenomena. The California Building Code (CBC; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2), contains provisions to safeguard against major structural failures or loss of life caused by earthquakes or other geologic hazards. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC for structural safety during a seismic event would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. In addition, according to the Sacramento County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update (LHMP), the project site is in an area of low susceptibility to liquefaction

⁴ Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/eqzapp/>, accessed on December 16, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

and levee collapse.⁵ Furthermore, the LHMP identifies a limited geographic extent for landslides in the area and identifies the likelihood of future occurrence as unlikely.⁶ Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact involving earthquake faults, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

- b) **Potential Impact.** This significance criterion will be assessed in the EIR.
- c) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As previously described in the discussion of criterion (a), the proposed project is in a limited geographic extent for landslides and the likelihood of future occurrence is unlikely. Additionally, the LMHP identifies that the project site is in an area of low susceptibility to liquefaction and levee collapse. Within the LHMP, the Delta in the southeast portion of the County is identified as having a high risk of subsidence and that islands and levees would be particularly affected. The proposed project is not near an island or levee and the LHMP did not identify the project site as an area of additional expected subsidence from 1998 to 2100.⁷ Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in development on a geologic unit or on soils that are unstable and could result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; impacts would therefore be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- d-f) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ Sacramento County, September 2021, Sacramento County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, <https://waterresources.saccounty.gov/stormready/Documents/LHMP%202021/Complete%202021%20Report/Full%20LHMP%20Report.pdf>, accessed on December 18, 2024.

⁶ Sacramento County, September 2021, Sacramento County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, <https://waterresources.saccounty.gov/stormready/Documents/LHMP%202021/Complete%202021%20Report/Full%20LHMP%20Report.pdf>, accessed on December 18, 2024.

⁷ Sacramento County, September 2021, Sacramento County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, <https://waterresources.saccounty.gov/stormready/Documents/LHMP%202021/Complete%202021%20Report/Full%20LHMP%20Report.pdf>, accessed on December 18, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

DISCUSSION

a-b) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Hazardous materials can be categorized as hazardous nonradioactive chemical materials, radioactive materials, and biohazardous materials (infectious agents such as microorganisms, bacteria, molds, parasites, viruses, and medical waste). Exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials could occur through, but not limited to, the following means: improper handling or use of hazardous materials or waste, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; and/or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

The proposed project is a long-range planning document to guide the future operation and improvements to the Delta Meadows Park Property, which would build off the existing uses (trails, fishing, motorized, and non-motorized boating, and other low-impact activities) and would not include any large structures that would expose people to hazardous materials. All construction, operation, and demolition activities would adhere to existing State and federal laws to ensure that construction workers and the general public are not exposed to any risks related to hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Parks utilize relatively small amounts of hazardous materials—such as cleansers, paints, fertilizers, and pesticides—when compared to more intensive (such as industrial) uses; use of hazardous materials would be mostly or entirely for cleaning and maintenance purposes. Use of such small amounts of hazardous materials would not pose substantial hazards to the public or the environment through accidental releases. Due to the proposed project involving a park property, the project site would utilize a small number of hazardous materials. Additionally, compliance with federal and State regulations would ensure impacts related to release of hazardous materials would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** There are no schools within 0.25 miles of the project site. The school closest to the project site is Walnut Grove Elementary located approximately 0.70 miles southwest of the project site. In addition, as a park, the proposed project would not include routine transport or disposing of hazardous materials. Project operation would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes, such as cleansers, degreasers, pesticides, and fertilizers. These potentially hazardous materials would not be of a type or be present in sufficient quantities to pose a significant hazard to public health and safety or the environment. Therefore, there would be no impact and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- d) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The project is not a hazardous materials site. A search of the online EnviroStor and GeoTracker databases on December 17, 2024, identified one site within 0.25 miles of the project site. The site is designated as a “Cleanup Program Site” with a status of Open - Verification Monitoring as of August 2019.⁸ Properties contaminated by hazardous substances are regulated at the local, State, and federal level and are subject to compliance with stringent laws and regulations for investigations and remediation. Compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations, would ensure that impacts related to development on hazardous materials sites would be less than significant and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- e) **No Impact.** The project is not within two miles of an airport or in an airport land use plan. The nearest airports to the project site are the Walnut Grove Airport, located approximately three miles southwest of the project site’s southern border and the Rio Vista Municipal Airport, over eleven miles to the west of the project site’s southern border. The project site is not within the boundaries of the Airport Land Use Plan for Rio Vista Municipal Airport and there is no airport land use plan for the Walnut Grove Airport. Therefore, there would be no impact and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- f) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not interfere in or result in substantial changes to the circulation patterns or emergency access routes and would not block or otherwise interfere with use of evacuation routes. Compliance with applicable regulations,

⁸ GeoTracker, 2024, Unocal Bulk Facility-Walnut Grove (SL0606742123), https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=SL0606742123, accessed on December 17, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

emergency and evacuation plans would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

- g) **No Impact.** The proposed project site is not located within a very high fire-hazard severity zone.⁹ Therefore, construction of the proposed project would have no impact related to wildland fire and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site;	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a-e) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	■	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁹ CAL Fire, 2023, Header Controller Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area, <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones>, accessed December 17, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature or the removal of a means of access that would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying areas. The proposed project would retain existing roadway patterns and would not introduce any new major roadways or other physical features through existing residential neighborhoods or other established communities that would create new barriers. Accordingly, there would be no impact and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.
- b) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in a long-range General Plan for the park site. As the proposed General Plan would provide a long-term framework for park development and operations, it would guide the future park improvements and management and ensure consistency between the proposed General Plan and federal and State laws, as well as with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Because the proposed General Plan is the overriding planning document for the park site, the impact would be less than significant. Therefore, this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a-b) **No Impact.** The California Geological Survey (CGS) classifies the regional significance of mineral resources in accordance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 and assists in the designation of lands containing significant aggregate resources. CSG's Mineral Land Classification (MLC) Project provides objective economic-geologic expertise to assist in the protection and development of mineral resources through the land-use planning process. The mineral resource zone (MRZ) boundaries for Sacramento County indicate that the project site is in MRZ-1.¹⁰ This MRZ indicates that the area is mined out of Portland cement concrete-grade (PCC-grade) aggregate resources. There are no mining facilities within the project

¹⁰ California Department of Conservation, 1999, Mineral Land Classification Map of PCC-Grade Aggregate Resources in Sacramento County, https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/?page=All-Data#data_s=id%3AdataSource_336-18a47b5b8e5-layer-10-192c08351d7-layer-30%3A9, accessed on December 16, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

site and the closest mine is approximately 11.6 miles southwest of the project site.¹¹ In addition, the project site has not been classified or nominated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.¹² Therefore, there would be no impact and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

XIII. NOISE

Would the proposed project result in:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-c) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

DISCUSSION

a-b) **No Impact.** In general, a project would be considered growth inducing if its implementation would result in substantial population increases and/or new development that might not occur if the project were not implemented. The proposed project is a high-level policy document that will create a General Plan for the park and be the overarching policy document that defines a

¹¹ California Department of Conservation, Mines Online, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html>

¹² California Department of Conservation, California Mineral Resources Data Portal, https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/?page=Mineral-Land-Classification#data_s=id%3AdataSource_336-18a47b5b8e5-layer-10-192c08351d7-layer-30%3A9, accessed on December 16, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

vision for future change and sets the land use and policy framework for the project site. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing and would not add permanent housing at the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact with regard to population and housing and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact.** The primary purpose of a public services impact analysis is to examine the impacts associated with physical improvements to public service facilities required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Public service facilities may need improvements (i.e., construction, renovation, or expansion) as demand for services increases. Increased demand is typically driven by increases in residential population. The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would exceed the ability of public service providers to adequately serve residents, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Fire protection services at the project site are provided by CAL FIRE and the Consumnes Community Service District.¹³ State Parks provides primary police protection services and receives assistance from the California Highway Patrol and the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department under concurrent jurisdiction. The nearest public schools and libraries include Walnut Grove Elementary School and Walnut Grove Library. As discussed in Section XIV, *Population and Housing*, the proposed project would not add permanent housing at the project site. As such, the proposed project would not require the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, including fire and police services, nor schools or libraries, in order for these agencies to maintain performance objectives. Therefore,

¹³ Sacramento County, 2018, Fire Districts, https://www.saccounty.gov/Government/Documents/SacCounty_FireDistricts.pdf, accessed on December 17, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

there would be no impact with regard to public services and this significance criterion will not be addressed in the EIR.

XVI. PARKS AND RECREATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a-b) **No Impact.** The proposed project is a policy-level document to guide the future operation and improvements to the project site as a continued recreational area, which would build off the existing uses (trails, fishing, motorized, and non-motorized boating, and other low-impact activities). The proposed project would build off the existing uses at the project site (trails, fishing, motorized, and non-motorized boating, and other low-impact activities) and create a State Park. Due to this, the proposed project would be increasing recreational opportunities in the area which would help contribute to decreasing any deterioration that might occur at existing neighborhood and regional parks from overuse. Therefore, there would be no impact due to the proposed project increasing recreational opportunities in the area and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a-d) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:			
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	■	□	□
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native American tribe.	■	□	□

DISCUSSION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1), defines a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (defined as historical resource, archaeological resource, or tribal cultural resource) involves the “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical would be materially impaired.”

a) **Potential Impact.** This significance criterion will be assessed in the EIR.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	■	□	□
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	■	□	□
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	■	□	□

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS NOT AFFECTED

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-e) **Potential Impact.** These significance criteria will be assessed in the EIR.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

DISCUSSION

a-d) **No Impact.** According to CAL FIRE, the project site is not located within any Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ), nor is the site in a State Responsibility Area.¹⁴ The nearest FHSZ is approximately 17 miles to the east. Because the project is not near a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high FHSZ, there would be no impact and these significance criteria will not be addressed in the EIR.

¹⁴ CAL FIRE, 2023, Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area, <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones>, accessed on December 18, 2024.