

46



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
915 "I" STREET
CITY HALL - ROOM 308

SACRAMENTO, CALIF. 95814
TELEPHONE (916) 449-5604

Marty Van Duyen
PLANNING DIRECTOR

March 6, 1980

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

MAR 11 1980

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

Subject: EXTENSION OF HOUSING ELEMENT OPERATIVE DATE (M-343)

Summary

Currently the adoption date for the 1980 Housing Element is April 1, 1980. Additional time to September 1, 1980, is needed for adequate review, comment and public hearings. Staff and the Planning Commission are recommending extension approval, Council hearing schedule approval, and adoption of a resolution for transmittal to the State Office of Planning and Research along with a required request for extension.

Background

The present operative date set by the State Department of Housing and Community Development for adoption of the 1980 Housing Element of the City's General Plan is April 1, 1980.

On February 21, 1980, the Planning Commission determined that additional staff, Commission and general public evaluation time is needed, deferring adoption of the element and its environmental assessment several months after the current operative date. Major reasons for this determination are:

1. Needed time up to 60 days beyond March 7th to evaluate recommendations of the Council-appointed Housing Element Committee (especially the inclusionary housing program) and satisfy local review and report preparation requirements for meeting CEQA guidelines;
2. Needed time beyond March 7th for the staff to further study and substantiate unmet housing needs for moderate income households, assess the impact of various programs upon the City's budget and staff needs, and provide additional information as requested by the Planning Commission and/or City Council; and

3. Needed time beyond April 1 to set aside sufficient study and public hearing time on this most important issue, this time already being constrained by other equally important issues such as the Central City Plan and the City's budget.

California Government Code Section 65302.6 states that the Director of Planning and Research may grant a reasonable extension of time not to exceed one year from the date of application for adoption of one or more general plan elements if the City's legislative body, after public hearing:

1. Adopts a resolution setting forth the reasons why an extension is necessary;
2. Ensures consistency of proposed land uses with existing general plan (including housing element) policies and procedures; and
3. Provides a copy of the specific budget and schedule for adoption.

Relative to these requirements, staff has incorporated the reasons for extension within the accompanying Resolution; is recommending continuance of policies and procedures identified in Attachment A; and is recommending an extension to September 1, 1980, based on the accompanying budget and processing schedule (Attachment B).

It should be noted that staff is recommending City Council hearings and adoption in June. The request for extension through August, however, is predicated on the possibility of unforeseen follow-up studies and the advice of OPR.

Vote of Commission

The Planning Commission, on February 21, 1980, unanimously approved extension of the housing element by a vote of nine ayes. In so doing, the Commission tentatively scheduled the study sessions and public hearings shown on Attachment B.

Recommendations

The staff and Planning Commission recommend that the City Council:

1. Approve the filed environmental negative declaration on the request for extension of the housing element deadline;
2. Adopt the resolution for extension of the housing element deadline to September 1, 1980; and
3. Establish hearing dates for City Council public hearings on the housing element and environmental assessment per Attachment B.

Respectfully submitted,


Marty Van Duyn
Planning Director

FOR TRANSMITTAL TO CITY COUNCIL:


Walter J. Slipe, City Manager

MVD:ML:jm
Attachments

Attachment A

INTERIM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The City of Sacramento shall continue to:

- . review proposed projects for General and Community Plan consistency;
- . implement the existing Housing Element's goals, objectives and programs including those for low/moderate income households;
- . implement the policies of the adopted Housing Assistance Plan which provides for low/moderate housing programs;
- . administer certain programs directed at meeting the low and moderate income housing needs of the City as funded in part or wholly through the Community Development and Block Grant Funds;
- . review and process proposed subdivisions in accordance with the State Map Act and City Subdivision Regulations;
- . require different housing types in residential subdivisions as specified by some of the City's Community Plans.

In addition, the City would implement any other housing programs that it finds necessary to require as an interim before the revised Housing Element is adopted by September 1, 1980.

Attachment B

BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR HOUSING ELEMENT PROCESSING AND ADOPTION

Assigned personnel

1 Senior Planner (80% of time)
1 Associate Planner (10% of time for environmental aspects)
Support staff as necessary (attorney, housing authority specialist, etc)
Consultant staff on environmental assessment

Funding of services

Planners and support staff are fully funded through City's general fund for fiscal year 1979/1980

Consultant services are funded to the extent of up to \$9,000 for preparation of an environmental assessment

Work program

Distribution of draft Housing Element with housing element committee recommendations on March 7 or 14

Distribution of draft Environmental Assessment on March 28 or April 4

Planning Commission special meeting and study sessions on March 20 and April 3

Planning Commission special meeting and public hearings on May 5 and 12

City Council special meeting and public hearing on May 28 (tentative)

City Council regular meeting and public hearing on June 10 (tentative)

Transmittal of adopted Housing Element and Environmental Determination immediately following close of last public hearing and action by City Council

Note: An additional period of time to September 1, 1980, is being requested of OPR in the event that follow-up studies, if any, can be adequately addressed as part of the housing element update.

RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by The Sacramento City Council on date of

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME
FOR THE PREPARATION AND ADOPTION OF THE HOUSING
ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF
SACRAMENTO

WHEREAS, the City, under the provisions of state law, must have completed and adopted the Housing Element of its General Plan prior to April 1, 1980; and

WHEREAS, the City Housing Element Committee and City Staff are continuing to analyze and study the housing stock and housing needs of the City in order to develop action programs which will address as specifically as possible the unmet housing needs in the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that it is not feasible to complete the requisite study and analysis by the April 1, 1980 deadline due to the complexity of the study and of the proposed programs, and in particular for the following reasons:

(a) the need for the City Planning Department and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency to assess the cost of staffing and administering a proposed inclusionary housing program, and to quantify the unmet housing needs of moderate income households, so that said information will be available to the City Planning Commission and City Council when each considers the Housing Element in general and the proposed inclusionary housing program in particular;

(b) the need to provide an adequate review and response time to all affected city departments so that the Housing Element and each of the recommended action programs, especially the proposed inclusionary housing program, may be thoroughly reviewed; a minimum six week review period is required due to the complexity of the issues, especially the proposed inclusionary housing program which will require extensive legal research and redrafting;

(c) the need to provide for the preparation and review of the environmental determination on the Housing Element, which will require 60 days after completion of the draft Housing Element;

(d) the importance and complexity of the Housing Element Committee's recommendations which will require extensive review by the City Planning Commission and City Council prior to adoption;

(e) the existence of equally important planning items now scheduled before both the City Planning Commission and City Council which necessitates the adjustment of the existing schedule for housing element adoption; and

WHEREAS, Section 65302.6 of the Government Code provides for, and sets forth the procedure for requesting, an extension of time on the preparation and adoption of the Housing Element, which procedure requires a resolution adopted by the City Council,

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

SECTION 1.

That the City Council hereby requests an extension of time for the completion and adoption of the Housing Element of the General Plan of 165 days or until September 1, 1980.

SECTION 2.

That the policies and procedures which will be used in approving development in the interim are attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference and will insure consistency with existing plans and, to the extent feasible, with the Housing Element to be adopted.

SECTION 3.

That the City Planning Director is hereby authorized as the City's contact person with the Office of Planning and Research concerning the extension of time.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

915 I STREET

CITY HALL ROOM 203

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

TELEPHONE (916) 448-5426

LORRAINE MAGANA
CITY CLERK

MEMORANDUM

TO: COUNCIL MEMBERS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

FROM: LORRAINE MAGANA, CITY CLERK

SUBJECT: COUNCIL MEETINGS

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 1980

The following are items scheduled through the month of May, 1980:

- Feb. 26 10 Planning Hearings
 - 1 Assessment Hearing
 - 2 Continued Planning Hearings (618-620 15th St. (P-8817) and Zubiri/Natomas Oaks Annexation) -(12-26-79)
 - 1 Setting public hearing Bruceville Rd. Annexation (continued from 1-15-80)
 - 3 SHRA Hearings - Rede Co., Victoria Park Condo., Magnolia Saloons and Lords Rest.

- March 3-4 2 Appeals CPA (P-8895) re Special Permit for sign at Valley Hi Dr. and Center Parkway.
P-8642 Special Permit re recreational vehicle storage facility at 21 Massie Court.
 - 1 Continued hearing Appeal CPC re 536 West El Camino (P-8669) (12-26-79)

- March 3-11 Reports re Condominium Conversions due.

- March 3-18 Hearing on Condo/Condo Conversions (M-394)

- March 3-25 No subject yet.

- April 1 Appeal - American River Village Condo Conversion

- April 8 Regular Meeting -

- April 15 Housing Element and Environmental Assessment (M-343)

(Cont.)

MEMORANDUM COUNCIL MEMBERS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

February 15, 1980

April 22	Executive Airport Quarterly Report
April 29	Housing Element and Environmental Assessment (M-243)
May 1	Special Council Meeting - Central City Plan hearing
May 6	Regular Meeting
May 13	" "
May 15	Special Council Meeting - Central City Plan Hearing
May 20	Regular Meeting
May 27	" "
May 29	Special Council Meeting - Central City Plan Hearing

1980

- Friday, February 1 - Submission of all Capital Improvement Departmental Budget requests to the City Manager.
- Tuesday, February 5 - City Council:
 - Review Annual CDBG Performance Report.
- Tuesday, February 12 - Estimated 6/30/80 Fund Balance(s) Report.
- Tuesday, February 19 - Department Budget Request Status Report to City Council.
- Tuesday, February 26 - Budget Policy Issues Report to Council.
- Thursday, March 6 - SRAPC - Technical Coordinating Committee and Human Services A-95 meetings:
 - Review of 1980-81 CDBG application.
- Thursday, March 20 - SRAPC Commission meeting:
 - Review of 1980-81 CDBG application.
- Friday, March 28 - Public notice of revenue sharing planned use.
- Monday, March 31 - Completion of budget requests review by Manager and Manager's staff.
- Monday, April 7 - Completion of preliminary budget typing.
 - Printing of preliminary budget through 4/14/80.
- Tuesday, April 8 - Public hearing of revenue sharing planned use.
 - City Council meeting:
 - Adoption of 1980-81 CDBG application, 1980-81 HAP Action Plan, and ratification of CEQA documents.
- Friday, April 14 - Submission of 1980-81 CDBG application to HUD.
- Tuesday, April 15 - Submit preliminary budget to Council and referral to Budget and Finance Committee.
- Friday, May 23 - Public notice of total and revenue sharing budget hearing.
- Tuesday, June 3 - Council review of preliminary budget through 6/17/80.
- Tuesday, June 17 - Council completes review of preliminary budget.
- Tuesday, June 24 - Council adoption of final budget.
- Tuesday, July 8 - Review of 1980-86 Capital Improvement Program by Budget and Finance and Planning and Community Development Committees.
- Tuesday, July 15 - Review of 1980-86 Capital Improvement Program by Budget and Finance and Planning and Community Development Committees.
- Tuesday, July 22 - Review of 1980-86 Capital Improvement Program by Budget and Finance and Planning and Community Development Committees.
- Thursday, July 24 - Public notice of availability of total and revenue sharing budget summary.
- Tuesday, July 29 - Review of 1980-86 Capital Improvement Program by Budget and Finance and Planning and Community Development Committees.



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Environmental Coordinator of the City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does prepare, make, declare, and publish this Negative Declaration for the following described project:

M-343 Extension of the Sacramento City's Housing Element operative date from April 1, 1980 to September 1, 1980.

The City of Sacramento Planning Department has reviewed the proposed project and determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. This conclusion is based on information contained in the attached Initial Study.

The following mitigation measures have been included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects: _____

None required

An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This environmental review process and Negative Declaration filing is pursuant to Division 6, Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 7, Section 15063 of the California Administrative Code and pursuant to the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 78-172) adopted by the City of Sacramento and pursuant to Sacramento City Code, Chapter 63.

A copy of this document may be reviewed/obtained at the Sacramento City Planning Department, 915 I Street, Room 308, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Ethan Browning, Jr.
Environmental Coordinator of the
City of Sacramento, California,
a municipal corporation

By *E. Browning*

FEB 28 3 18 PM '80

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
CITY OF SACRAMENTO
M-343



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Planning Department
915 I St., Room 308
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel. 916 - 449-5604

INITIAL STUDY

BACKGROUND

- Name of Proponent City of Sacramento
- Address and Phone Number of Proponent:
915 I Street, Room 308
Sacramento, CA 95814
- Date of Checklist Submitted 29 Feb 80
- Agency Requiring Checklist Sacramento City Plan. Dept.
- Name of Proposal, if applicable Housing Element Extension

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

(Explanations of all "yes" and "maybe" are provided)

M-343

	YES	MAYBE	NO
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>

	YES	MAYBE	NO
3. <u>Water</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction 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 of 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>
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?	---	---	<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 number 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>

	YES	MAYBE	NO		YES	MAYBE	NO
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	---	---	X	e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	---	---	X
d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	---	---	X	f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?	---	---	X
6. <u>Noise</u> . Will the proposal result in:				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. Increases in existing noise levels?	---	---	X	a. Fire protection?	---	---	X
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	---	---	X	b. Police protection?	---	---	X
7. <u>Light and Glare</u> . Will the proposal produce new light or glare?	---	---	X	c. Schools?	---	---	X
8. <u>Land Use</u> . Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	---	---	X	d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	---	---	X
9. <u>Natural Resources</u> . Will the proposal result in:				e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	---	---	X
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	---	---	X	f. Other governmental services?	---	---	X
b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?	---	---	X	15. <u>Energy</u> . Will the proposal result in:			
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?	---	---	X	a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	---	---	X
11. <u>Population</u> . Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population?	---	---	X	b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	---	---	X
12. <u>Housing</u> . Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?	---	---	X	16. <u>Utilities</u> . Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:			
13. <u>Transportation/Circulation</u> . Will the proposal result in:				a. Power or natural gas?	---	---	X
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?	---	---	X	b. Communications systems?	---	---	X
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	---	---	X	c. Water?	---	---	X
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?	---	---	X	d. Sewer or septic tanks?	---	---	X
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	---	---	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

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

	<u>YES</u>	<u>MAYBE</u>	<u>NO</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>Archaeological/Historical.</u> Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archaeological 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 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>

See attached sheet for discussion.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 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 on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
- I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

Date 29 Feb 80

C. Aronson
(Signature)

Project Evaluation M-343

The proposed project is a request by the City to the State for a five month extension from the April 1, 1980, requirement of having an update/adopted Housing Element. The City has established a Housing Advisory Committee which has developed goals and action programs to provide a diverse housing stock within the City. These action programs include condominium conversion controls, low income housing, a fair housing council and inclusionary strategies such as 10% mandatory requirement, resale controls and density bonus. These programs are complex and have taken the Housing Advisory Committee longer than previously scheduled. The Committee has forwarded the draft Housing Element to the City Planning Commission. The proposed programs in the Housing Element have generated much interest in the community; therefore, an extension would provide the public with additional time to review the draft Housing Element and would provide time for additional public hearings by the Planning Commission and City Council.

The extension for a five month time period will not significantly affect the City's policy of providing diverse housing stock because the City shall continue to:

- review proposed projects for General and Community Plan consistences;
- implement the existing Housing Element's goals, objectives and programs including those for low/moderate income households;
- implement the policies of the adopted Housing Assistance Plan which provides for low/moderate housing programs;
- administer certain programs directed at meeting the low and moderate income housing needs of the City as funded in part or wholly through the Community Development and Block Grant Funds;
- review and process proposed subdivisions in accordance with the State Map Act and the City Subdivision Regulations;
- require different housing types in residential subdivisions as specified by some of the City's Community Plans.

In addition, the City would implement any other housing programs that it finds necessary to require as an interim before the revised Housing Element is adopted by September 1, 1980.

REFERENCES

- Sacramento City General Plan and EIR, 1974
Sacramento City Zoning Ordinance, November 1978
Sacramento City Floodplain Ordinance, 1978
Sacramento City American River Parkway Plan, 1975
Sacramento City Bikeway Plan and EIR, 1976
Sacramento River Parkway Plan, 1975
SRAPC Regional Land Use Plan 2001, 1976
SRAPC Regional Energy Conservation Plan, 1977
SRAPC Regional Transportation Plan, 1977
SRAPC Air Quality Maintenance Plan, 1978
Sacramento Central City 1990 Comprehensive Plan EIR, 1977
Sacramento South Pocket Specific Plan and EIR, 1977
Sacramento South Natomas Community Plan and EIR, 1978
Sacramento Delta Shores PUD EIR, 1979
Sacramento Old City- A Preservation Program, 1977
Seven Lakes PUD Negative Declaration, 1977
Capitol Park Project EIR, 1974
Commercial Development in the Point West PUD (Woolco) EIR, 1977
Discovery Oaks Residential Development Negative Declaration, 1977
Johnston Industrial Park Unit #4 EIR, 1976
Meadow Gate I and II EIR, 1974
Norwood/ I-880 Industrial Park EIR, 1975
River City Commons Negative Declaration, 1977
Tsakopoulos Borrow Operation Draft EIR, 1976
Tsakopoulos Mobile Home Park EIR, 1975
University Park Negative Declaration, 1979
- Sacramento County Environmental Studies: Methods for Environmental Management, Vol I; Sacramento County's Physical Environment, Vol. II, 1972
- At the Crossroads, A Report on California Endangered and Rare Fish and Wildlife. California Resources Agency and Department of Fish and Game, 1972
- Soils of Sacramento County, CA. Walter Weir, Divisions of Soils, U.C. Berkeley, 1950
- Eleventh Progress Report on Trip Ends Generation Research Counts, California Department of Transportation, 1976