



# CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE  
**RECEIVED**  
JUN 2 1981

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

June 2, 1981

City Council  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Negative Declaration for Interim  
Fire Station No. 15

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 Interim Fire Station No. 15 would not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared. On May 18, 1981 the Negative Declaration was filed with the County. On May 21, 1981 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

JUN - 9 1981

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. Slife, City Manager

RHP/hma

att.

June 9, 1981  
District No. 1

# RESOLUTION NO. 81-396

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

June 9, 1981

RESOLUTION APPROVING NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR INTERIM FIRE STATION NO. 15

WHEREAS, on May 18, 1981 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: INTERIM FIRE STATION NO. 15

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, INTERIM FIRE STATION NO. 15 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 construction of a single family residence modified to serve as a fire station for a period of six to ten years.
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

JUN - 9 1981

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:

Interim Fire Station No. 15 - Construction of a single family residence modified to serve as a fire station for a period of six to ten years.

2. Location of Project:

The intersection of Truxel Road and Newborough Drive

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

JUN - 9 1981

OFFICE OF THE  
CITY CLERK

DATED: May 13, 1981

**ENDORSED**

MAY 13 1981

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

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

By   
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))

Interim Fire Station No. 15 - Construction of a single family residence modified to serve as a fire station for a period of six to ten years.

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

Project is located in a residential area at the intersection of Truxel Road and Newborough Drive.

## 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 project is compatible with the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan of the City of Sacramento.

Date May 13, 1981

Janette D. Gispell  
(Signature)

Title Administrative Assistant

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
INITIAL STUDY  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. 1052

Date: 5/13/81

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project Interim Fire Station No. 15

---

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 Revenue Sharing

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 in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
i. 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>	—	—
b. Police 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)

1.b. Normal overcovering and compaction for the construction of the building and parking area.

3.b. Minor alterations for site drainage.

6.a. There will be an increase in the existing noise level during construction as a result of the construction equipment and, once in operation, there will be alarms and sirens during alarm situations.

6.b. The siren noise during alarm situations may result in a severe noise level.

13.f. During alarm situations, there may be an increase in traffic hazards resulting from the departure of the fire trucks.

14.a. Fire protection in the area will be increased as a result of the project.

14.e. The project will result in an insignificant increase in building maintenance and grounds maintenance.

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

1.b. None

3.b. None

6.a. None

6.b. None

13.f. A signal system with a warning flasher will be installed to decrease the occurrence of traffic hazards.

14.a. None

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 - There would be a lack of fire protection in the area.

Construct a permanent station at this location - within a few years the permanent station would not be compatible with the fire protection master plan.

Construct an Interim station on an alternate site - The selected site provides the optimum fire protection for the development over the projected period of use.

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 May 13, 1981

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Title Administrative Assistant