



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

10

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
JAN 29 1980

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

F/Ref. c.c. 2207

R. H. PARKER
CITY ENGINEER

January 28, 1980

J. F. VAROZZA
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Negative Declaration for ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK

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 ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK would not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared. On January 22, 1980, the Negative Declaration was filed with the County Clerk. On January 24, 1980, 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.
3. Approve the project.
4. Authorize the Environmental Coordinator to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

Recommendation Approved:

Walter J. Slipe
Walter J. Slipe, City Manager

RHP/1c

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Parker
R. H. PARKER
City Engineer

February 5, 1980
District 6

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 5 1980

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

RESOLUTION No. 80-067

Adopted by The Sacramento City Council on date of

February 5, 1980

RESOLUTION APPROVING NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA
SCHOOL PARK

WHEREAS, on January 22, 1980, 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:

ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK

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 ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK will not have a significant adverse 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 ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK.
4. That the Environmental Coordinator is authorized to file with the County Clerk a Notice of Determination for said project.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 5 1980

OFFICE OF THE
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:
ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELLIA SCHOOL PARK
Acquire a two-acre parcel and develop it with an athletic field and two tennis courts.
2. Location of Project:
At the intersection of Fortress Drive and Tomahawk Way in the City of Sacramento
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 Iry Moraes
6. A copy of the Initial Study and this Negative Declaration may be obtained at 915 - I Street, Room 207, Sacramento, California 95814.

DATED: January 21, 1980

ENDORSED:
Filed

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

JAN 22 1980

J.A. SIMPSON
BY AL WOODS
DEPUTY


R. H. PARKER, City Engineer

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))

Acquisition and Development of Camellia School Park - Acquire a two-acre parcel and develop it with an athletic field and two tennis courts.

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

The site to be acquired is a two acre single family residential parcel in a residential area with a school adjoining the west and north border.

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))

The proposed park development is not in conflict with existing zoning and is in conformance with the City's Park Masterplan.

Date January 21, 1980


(Signature)

Title Real Estate Supervisor

CITY OF
 INSTANT CITY
 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. 2207

Date: 1/21/80

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project Acquisition and Development of Camellia School Park

2. City Department Initiating Project Community Services
3. Name of Individual Preparing Checklist Irv Moraes
4. Is Checklist Being Prepared for CEQA X or NEPA ?
5. Source of Funding of Project AB-B

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
1. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal wave?	—	—	<u>X</u>
4. <u>Plant Life</u> . 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)?	<u>X</u>	—	—
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	<u>X</u>	—	—
d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?	—	—	<u>X</u>
5. <u>Animal Life</u> . 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)?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	—	—	<u>X</u>
6. <u>Noise</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in existing noise levels?	<u>X</u>	—	—
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	—	—	<u>X</u>
7. <u>Light and Glare</u> . Will the proposal produce new light or glare?	<u>X</u>	—	—
8. <u>Land Use</u> . Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?	<u>X</u>	—	—
9. <u>Natural Resources</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?	—	—	<u>X</u>
10. <u>Risk of Upset</u> . 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?	—	—	<u>X</u>
11. <u>Population</u> . Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?	—	—	<u>X</u>
12. <u>Housing</u> . Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?	<u>X</u>	—	—
13. <u>Transportation/Circulation</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	—	—	<u>X</u>
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	—	—	<u>X</u>
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?	—	—	<u>X</u>
14. <u>Public Services</u> . 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?	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	<u>X</u>	—	—
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	—	—	<u>X</u>
f. Other governmental services?	—	—	<u>X</u>
15. <u>Energy</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	—	—	<u>X</u>
16. <u>Utilities</u> . Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:			
a. Power or natural gas?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Communications systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Water?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	—	—	<u>X</u>
e. Storm water drainage?	—	—	<u>X</u>
f. Solid waste and disposal?	—	—	<u>X</u>
17. <u>Human Health</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?	—	—	<u>X</u>
18. <u>Aesthetics</u> . 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?	—	—	<u>X</u>
19. <u>Recreation</u> . Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	<u>X</u>	—	—
20. <u>Archeological/Historical</u> . Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	—	—	<u>X</u>
21. <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> .			
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?	—	—	<u>X</u>
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.)	—	—	<u>X</u>
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.)	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	—	—	<u>X</u>

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

1b. Soil will be disrupted during the construction of the recreation facilities.

4a. Development of the recreation area will require removing three trees.

4c. New species of plants will be introduced as part of the park development.

6a. Recreational areas tend to generate noise; however, the increase in noise level should not be significant.

7. The two new tennis courts will be lit.

8. The two acre parcel will be changed from residential use to park use.

12. One single family residence will be removed as a result of this project.

13d. This project will create a new park, with consequent maintenance needs.

19. This project will increase the recreational opportunities of the surrounding neighborhood.

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

The present owner of the single family residence will be justly compensated for his property, as well as being paid relocation costs.

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)

1. No Project - This alternative would eliminate the need to remove a single family residence; however, it would prevent the City from meeting the recreational needs of the neighborhood.

2. Locate the park at another site - This alternative would increase the cost of the recreational facilities significantly.

VI. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

- 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 January 21, 1980

David E. Moore
(Signature)

Title Real Estate Supervisor