



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

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

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
FEB 17 1982

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

February 16, 1982

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Negative Declaration for Fire Station No. 17

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 Fire Station No. 17 would not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared. On February 3, 1982 the Negative Declaration was filed with the County Clerk. On February 8, 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.
3. Approve the project.
4. Authorize the Environmental Coordinator to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 23 1982

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

Respectfully submitted,

Recommendation Approved:

Walter J. Slipes
Walter J. Slipes, City Manager

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

February 23, 1982
District No. 2

RESOLUTION NO. 82-111

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

February 23, 1982

RESOLUTION APPROVING NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR

Fire Station No. 17

WHEREAS, on February 3, 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: Fire Station No. 17

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 Fire Station No. 17
_____ 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 constructing the firehouse and its associated driveways and parking area, and relocation of the drainage ditch across the site.
4. That the Environmental Coordinator is authorized to file with the County Clerk a Notice of Determination for said project.

ATTEST:

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 23 1982

MAYOR

CITY CLERK

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:
FIRE STATION NO. 17 - CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIREHOUSE AND ITS ASSOCIATED DRIVEWAYS AND PARKING AREA, AND RELOCATION OF THE DRAINAGE DITCH ACROSS THE SITE.
2. Location of Project:
NORTHWEST CORNER OF INTERSECTION OF MARYSVILLE BOULEVARD AND BELL AVENUE.
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

FEB 23 1982

DATED: JANUARY 29, 1982

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

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

ENDORSED

FEB 3 1982

By 
R. H. PARKER, City Engineer

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

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))

FIRE STATION NO. 17 - CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIREHOUSE AND ITS
ASSOCIATED DRIVEWAYS AND PARKING AREA AND RELOCATION OF
THE DRAINAGE DITCH ACROSS THE SITE.

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

NORTHWEST CORNER OF MARYSVILLE BOULEVARD AND BELL AVENUE. AREA
IS ZONED R-1, WITH RESIDENCES ON SOUTH ACROSS BELL AVENUE AND ADJOINING ON
THE WEST. OPEN FIELDS ARE ON THE NORTH AND NORTHEAST ACROSS
MARYSVILLE BOULEVARD.

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 COMPATIBLE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE OF
THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO.

Date JANUARY 29 1982

Janet H. Crispell
 (Signature)

Title ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. 2724

Date: JAN. 29, 1962

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project FIRE STATION No. 17

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 GENERAL 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>
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	—	—	X
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	—	—	X
f. Other governmental services?	—	—	X
15. <u>Energy</u> . 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. <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?	—	—	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. <u>Human Health</u> . 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. <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?	—	—	X
19. <u>Recreation</u> . Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	—	—	X
20. <u>Archeological/Historical</u> . Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	—	—	X
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?	—	—	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

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)

USE OF AN ALTERNATE SITE - OTHER POSSIBLE SITES IN THE AREA WOULD REQUIRE A LARGER AREA FOR THE FIRE STATION BECAUSE OF THE DIFFERENT LAYOUT CONFIGURATIONS AND WOULD HAVE A GREATER EFFECT ON TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IN THE VICINITY OF THE FIRE STATION. NO PROJECT - NO PROJECT WOULD LEAVE THE AREA WITH INADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION. THE EXISTING FIRE STATIONS, WHICH ARE TO BE REPLACED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT, OVERLAP THEIR AREAS OF EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TIME BUT FAIL TO COVER OTHER AREAS. THE PROPOSED LOCATION WILL ELIMINATE THIS DEFICIENCY.

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 29, 1982

Suzette H. Cispell
(Signature)
Title ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT