7

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
MAR 16 1982

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING
915 I STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
CITY HALL ROOM 207 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5281

R. H. PARKER
CITY ENGINEER
J. F. VAROZZA
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER

March 11, 1982

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Negative Declaration for FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE

SUMMARY:

The Environmental Coordinator has reviewed the subject project and finds that it will not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and therefore recommends that the project and a Negative Declaration be approved by the City Council.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with State EIR Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, dated December 1976, an Initial Study was performed. As a result of this study, it was determined that the FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE would not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared. On February 24, 1982 the Negative Declaration was filed with the County Clerk. On March 1, 1982 Notice of Opportunity for Public Review of the draft Negative Declaration was published in The Sacramento Union. The appropriate length of time has elapsed for receipt of comments regarding the Negative Declaration, with no comments having been received.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Environmental Coordinator recommends that the attached resolution be passed which will:

1. Determine that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2. Approve the Negative Declaration.

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

MAR 23 1982

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

3. Approve the project.

4. Authorize the Environmental Coordinator to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. PARKER
City Engineer

Recommendation Approved:

Walter J. Slipe, City Manager

March 23, 1982
District No. 6

RESOLUTION NO. 82-186

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

RESOLUTION APPROVING NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16)
FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST
APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE

WHEREAS, on February 24, 1982, R. H. Parker, the Environmental Coordinator of the City of Sacramento, filed a Negative Declaration with the County Clerk of Sacramento County for the following proposed City initiated project: FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE

WHEREAS, the prescribed time for receiving appeals has elapsed and no appeals were received.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

1. That the proposed project FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS will not have a significant effect on the environment.

2. That the Negative Declaration for the above-described project is hereby approved.

3. That the above-described project is hereby approved for the purpose of installing curb, gutter, sidewalk, water main, and drainage line on the north side of Jackson Road (Highway 16) from intersection of Florin Perkins Road, west approximately 0.2 mile.

4. That the Environmental Coordinator is authorized to file with the County Clerk a Notice of Determination for said project.

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

MAR 23 1982

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

ATTEST:

MAYOR

CITY CLERK

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to Division 6, Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 7, Section 15083 of the California Administrative Code and pursuant to the Procedures and Guidelines for preparation and processing of Environmental Impact Reports (Resolution 78-172) adopted by the City of Sacramento, pursuant to Sacramento City Code Chapter 63, the Environmental Coordinator of the City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does prepare, make, declare, publish, and cause to be filed with the County Clerk of Sacramento County, State of California this Negative Declaration regarding the project described as follows:

1. Title and Short Description of Project:
FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - INSTALLATION OF CURB, GUTTER, SIDEWALK, WATER MAIN, AND DRAINAGE LINE ON NORTH SIDE OF JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE.

2. Location of Project:
JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, TOWARD THE WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE.

3. The Proponent of the Project: City of Sacramento

4. It is found that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the initial study is attached, which documents the reasons supporting the above finding and any mitigation measures included in the project to avoid any potentially significant effects identified in the initial study.

5. The Initial Study was Prepared by GARRETT D. CRISPELL

6. A copy of the Initial Study and this Negative Declaration may be obtained at 915 - I Street, Room 207, Sacramento, California 95814.

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

MAR 23 1982

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

DATED: FEBRUARY 22, 1982

Environmental Coordinator of the City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation

By _____
R. H. PARKER, City Engineer

ENDORSED

FEB 24 1982

J.A. SIMPSON, CLERK
By R. WEESHOFF, Deputy

C.C.#

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

INITIAL STUDY

References are to California Administrative Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 7, Section 15080.

1. Title and Description of Project (15080(c)(1))

FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - NORTH SIDE OF JACKSON ROAD (HIGHWAY 16) FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE. INSTALL CURB, GUTTER, SIDEWALK AND DRAINAGE LINE.

2. Environmental Setting (15080(c)(2))

THE PROJECT AREA IS IN A HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ZONE.

3. Environmental Effects - Attached checklist must be completed by person conducting initial study (15080(c)(3)).

4. Mitigation Measures - Attached list of mitigation measures must be completed by person conducting initial study (15080(c)(4)).

5. Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans (15080(c)(5))
PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO.

Date FEBRUARY 22, 1982

Garrett D. Cuspell
(Signature)

Title ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. _____

Date: FEBR.22,1982

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS - NORTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY 16 FROM INTERSECTION OF FLORIN PERKINS ROAD, WEST APPROXIMATELY 0.2 MILE.
2. City Department Initiating Project ENGINEERING
3. Name of Individual Preparing Checklist GARRETT D. CRISPELL
4. Is Checklist Being Prepared for CEQA X or NEPA ___?
5. Source of Funding of Project PRIVATE FUNDS

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
(Explanations of all "yes" and "maybe" answers are required under Item III.)

	Yes	Maybe	No
1. Earth. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?	___	___	X
b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?	X	___	___
c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?	___	___	X
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	___	___	X
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	___	___	X
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?	___	___	X
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	___	___	X
2. Air. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?	___	X	___
b. The creation of objectionable odors?	___	___	X
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	___	___	X
3. Water. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?	___	___	X
b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?	___	___	X
c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?	___	___	X
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	___	___	X
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	___	___	X
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters.	___	___	X
g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?	___	___	X
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	___	___	X

i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal wave?	—	—	X
4. Plant Life. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?	—	—	X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?	—	—	X
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	—	—	X
d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?	—	—	X
5. Animal Life. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects or microfauna)?	—	—	X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	—	—	X
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	—	—	X
d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	—	—	X
6. Noise. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in existing noise levels?	X	—	—
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	—	—	X
7. Light and Glare. Will the proposal produce new light or glare?	—	—	X
8. Land Use. Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?	—	—	X
9. Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	—	—	X
b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?	—	—	X
10. Risk of Upset. Does the proposal involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?	—	—	X
11. Population. Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?	—	—	X
12. Housing. Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?	—	—	X
13. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?	—	—	X
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	—	—	X
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?	—	—	X
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	—	—	X
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	—	—	X
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?	—	—	X
14. Public Services. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
a. Fire protection?	—	—	X
b. Police protection?	—	—	X
c. Schools?	—	—	X

	Yes	Maybe	No
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	—	—	X
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	X	—	—
f. Other governmental services?	—	—	X
15. Energy. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	—	—	X
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	—	—	X
16. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:			
a. Power or natural gas?	—	—	X
b. Communications systems?	—	—	X
c. Water?	—	—	X
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	—	—	X
e. Storm water drainage?	—	—	X
f. Solid waste and disposal?	—	—	X
17. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	—	—	X
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	—	—	X
18. Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	—	—	X
19. Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	—	—	X
20. Archeological/Historical. Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	—	—	X
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance.			
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	—	—	X
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)	—	—	X
c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.	—	—	X
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	—	—	X

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (any "yes" or "maybe" answers must be explained - attached additional sheets if necessary)

1. EARTH

b. THE SHOULDER OF THE ROADWAY WILL BE EXCAVATED, COMPACTED AND OVERCOVERED TO INSTALL THE CURB, GUTTER AND SIDEWALK AND TO WIDEN THE ROADWAY TO ALLOW FOR CHANNELIZATION.

2. AIR

a. CONSTRUCTION WILL GENERATE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF DUST WHICH MAY CAUSE A SLIGHT DETERIORATION OF LOCAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY DURING CONSTRUCTION.

6. NOISE

a. CONSTRUCTION WILL GENERATE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF NOISE, BUT IT IS NOT EXPECTED TO HAVE MORE THAN A TEMPORARY MINOR ADVERSE EFFECT ON NEIGHBORING BUSINESSES.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

e. MAINTENANCE - THE PROJECT WILL ADD TO THE AMOUNT OF ROADWAY, WATER SUPPLY AND DRAINAGE SYSTEMS TO BE MAINTAINED. HOWEVER, THE AMOUNT TO BE ADDED IS INSIGNIFICANT WITH RESPECT TO THE TOTAL CURRENTLY MAINTAINED BY THE CITY.

IV. Mitigation measures proposed to minimize environmental impacts for the project as identified above. (Explain in detail - if none, so state)

1.b. NONE

2.a & 6.a. RIGID CONTROLS WILL BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION TO MINIMIZE DUST AND NOISE POLLUTION, ENHANCE THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND PROTECT EXISTING PROPERTY AND IMPROVEMENTS.

14.e. NONE

V. Alternatives to the project which would produce less of an adverse impact on the environment (lower density, less intense land use, move building on site, no project, et cetera)

No project – If the improvements are not constructed, there would be no reduction in fire danger in the area, because currently there are no fire hydrants available, and the property owners obtain their water supply from wells. Pedestrians on the north side of Jackson Road (Highway 16) would not be provided with adequate protection with the lack of curb, gutter and sidewalk. Also the drainage along the north side of the roadway would be inadequate and could result in damage to the adjacent property.

VI. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

[X] I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

[ ] I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in IV above have been added to the project or the possibility of a significant effect on the environment is so remote as to be insignificant.

[ ] I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IS REQUIRED.

Date February 22, 1982

Garrett D. Campbell
(Signature)

Title Administrative Assistant