

47



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF LAW
812 TENTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
SUITE 201 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5346

JAMES P. JACKSON
City Attorney
THEODORE H. KOBAY, JR.
Assistant City Attorney
SAMUEL L. JACKSON
WILLIAM P. CARNAZZO
LAWRENCE M. LUNARDINI
DIANE B. BALTER
RICHARD F. ANTOINE
TAMARA L. MILLIGAN-HARMON
Deputy City Attorneys

January 27, 1986

City Council
Sacramento, CA

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: 1986 South Natomas Community Plan

DISCUSSION

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

JAN 28 1986

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

Attached are the resolutions certifying the EIR and adopting the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan. If the Council wants to adopt the Plan, the EIR resolution should first be adopted, followed by the resolution adopting the Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE H. KOBAY, JR.
Assistant City Attorney

THK/jmv
Attachments

January 28, 1986
All Districts

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORTING ADOPTION OF THE 1986
SOUTH NATOMAS COMMUNITY PLAN AND AMENDMENTS TO
THE 1974 GENERAL PLAN

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The 1986 South Natomas Community Plan supercedes the 1978 South Natomas Community Plan for the South Natomas area. The General Plan amendments to the land use element are necessary in order that the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan be consistent with the General Plan. The 1986 South Natomas Plan incorporates certain projects as approved by the City Council for which findings have been or will be made.

B. THE RECORD

For the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the findings herein, the record of the proceeding for the project is comprised of the following:

1. The environmental check list and all other environmental documents prepared by the Planning Department, including the EIR, Environmental Questionnaire, Initial Study, and the soon-to-be-filed Notice of Determination;

2. All staff and consultant reports, including the proposed Blayney-Dyett Plan dated November, 1984, and the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan (1986 SNCP), memoranda, maps, letters, minutes of meetings and other planning documents relating to the 1986 Community Plan and the thirteen (13) applications (including previously approved Gateway Center and Creekside Oaks);

3. The proceedings before the Planning Commission and the City Council relating to the 1986 Community Plan and applications, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the public hearings;

4. Matters of common knowledge to the Council, including but not limited to:

- (a) The 1974 General Plan, including the land use map and all elements thereof;
- (b) The text and land use map of the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan;
- (c) The Air Quality Maintenance Plan adopted by the City Council;
- (d) The City Zoning Ordinance;

- (e) All other land use applications the South and North Natomas Community areas submitted prior to final approval on this project; and
- (f) Other formally adopted City policies and ordinances.

C. FINDINGS

The City Council declares that it received and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to approving the 1986 SNCP. Based on the record, as described in Section B above, the City Council hereby resolves and makes the following findings:

1. The EIR is adequate, complete and satisfies in all respects the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and City regulations implementing CEQA.

2. Each and every potentially significant environmental impact disclosed in the EIR is either less than significant, will be less than significant due to the imposition of mitigation measures included in the South Natomas Community Plan and/or as conditions of project approval, or has been reduced in significance to the greatest extent feasible.

Following are potentially significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the EIR for the 1986 Community Plan project, a specific finding for each such impact, and a brief rationale for each finding:

<u>Potential Significant Impact</u>	<u>Findings and Rationale</u>
Conversion of agricultural land.	To the extent significant, infeasible to mitigate. As a practical matter, farming cannot occur because agricultural operations are inconsistent with the urbanization contemplated by the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan.
Potential for incompatible land uses.	To the extent significant, projects will develop as planned unit developments, giving the opportunity for building location and design, landscaping and other buffering to provide for compatibility of land uses to the extent feasible.
Police services and facilities.	To the extent significant, the mitigation measures identified in the EIR will be required or instituted to the extent feasible following adoption of the Community Plan.

Potential Significant Impact

Findings and Rationale

Fire services and facilities.

To the extent significant, will be mitigated by the requirement of hazardous waste management plans which will be required as a condition of approval for business parks.

Libraries.

Insignificant. The library site is designated in the Plan and has been acquired. The Facilities Benefit Assessment District contemplated by the Plan can provide a funding mechanism for library construction.

Schools.

To the extent significant, will be mitigated because school sites are designated for reservation on the 1986 SNCP. In addition, the impacts identified in the EIR and the Plan have been or will be mitigated to the extent feasible through the imposition of school impaction fees and bussing, depending upon actions of affected school districts. Based on the foregoing, the school impacts have been mitigated to the extent feasible.

Parks. Designation of 22 acres less than that necessary for 5 acres/1000 population for neighborhood/community parks.

To the extent significant, mitigated to the extent feasible by the Plan policy that the City-wide standards of 5 acres per thousand for neighborhood and community parks will be met. In addition, the existence of the Discovery Park and the American River Parkway within the Plan area provides extensive recreational opportunities. The 1986 SNCP designates 91 acres more for parks than the 1978 SNCP.

Traffic increase.

This impact has been reduced to the greatest extent feasible by the following mitigation measures:

1. The Plan policy to form a facility benefit assessment district which could provide funding for the road improvements necessary to mitigate the traffic congestion identified in the EIR.

Potential Significant Impact

Findings and Rationale

2. The Plan policy to prepare a transportation system management (TSM) program to reduce peak-hour traffic generated by office and business parks by at least 20 percent and to require office/business parks to show such a traffic reduction resulting from TSM programs, if necessary, in order to maintain Level of Service C.

3. Plan policy that zoning changes or development agreements authorizing additional office/business park areas shown on the Plan shall await demonstration that traffic capacity sufficient to maintain LOS C in the Plan area will be available.

Air Quality - Violation of carbon monoxide standards and contribution to regional smog problems.

These impacts will be reduced to the greatest extent feasible by the Plan policies identified above as mitigation measures for mitigation of traffic impacts.

Noise - Increase in noise levels affecting both residential and non-residential uses.

This impact will be reduced to the extent feasible through the design and location of buildings, landscaping as part of Project approvals and sound attenuation walls for residential uses adjoining freeways.

Energy. Increase over existing peak electrical demand; need for substation.

To the extent significant, these effects can be mitigated by the institution of energy conservation measures as part of individual project approvals and the construction, by SMUD, of needed substations.

Geology and soils. Removal of prime agricultural soils from production.

To the extent significant, infeasible to mitigate. The rationale pertaining to the impact of conversion of agricultural land, above, also applies here.

Hydrology and drainage. Increased flows cannot be accommodated.

Will be mitigated by installation of necessary systems improvements at developer's expense.

Potential Significant Impact

Findings and Rationale

Biology. Elimination of agricultural waste, field and fence row habitat and associated wildlife.

To the extent significant, infeasible to mitigate. The rationale pertaining to the impact of conversion of agricultural lands, above, also applies here.

Biology. Disturbance to riparian habitat along Bannon Slough and Main Drainage Canal.

Mitigated to the extent feasible by the deeding to the City of the Bannon Slough Park site and other conditions of approval for Natomas Corporate Center relating thereto.

Aesthetics.

Mitigated to the extent feasible through design review and setback requirements.

Cultural resources.

Insignificant, except for the southwest corner of the South Natomas community. In that area the impact will be mitigated to the extent feasible through the imposition of project conditions which require the cessation of construction if artifacts are discovered, until qualified examination is performed and recommendations made.

Cumulative Impacts.

The cumulative impacts section of the EIR analyzes a "worst case" situation because it assumes that the thirteen South Natomas applications, in addition to to five North Natomas applications, will be approved. These impacts have been identified in the EIR and have been mitigated to the greatest extent feasible in the 1986 South Natomas Community Plan by the mitigation measures previously identified herein.

3. Alternatives.

The City Council further finds that adoption of any of the alternatives is not a feasible method to reduce the traffic congestion and the air quality impacts identified in the EIR. These impacts are the cumulatively significant result of development in the Plan area and surrounding area. The alternatives are:

- (a) The No-Project Alternative. This alternative assumed the existing environment, i.e., that no further development would occur in the Plan area.

- (b) The 1978 SNCP Alternative. This alternative assumed that the property would be developed in accordance with the approved 1978 SNCP.
- (c) The 1984 Draft SNCP Alternative (Blayney-Dyett Plan. This alternative would result in development pursuant to that plan.
- (d) The City Planning Commission Recommendation. This alternative would result in development pursuant to that plan.
- (e) 13 Projects Alternative. This alternative would result in the approval of all project applications analyzed in the EIR.

The alternatives are infeasible based on the following facts and rationale:

- (1) It is economically unproductive to farm the vacant property in the Plan area, given the surrounding adjacent existing and planned residential uses. Therefore, the Council has rejected the No-Project Alternative as a means to reduce traffic and air quality impacts.
- (2) While the 1978 SNCP, the Blayney-Dyett Plan, or the City Planning Commission recommendation alternatives would contribute less to adverse traffic and air quality impacts than the approved Plan, the EIR states that the 1978 SNCP Alternative and the Blayney-Dyett Plan would also contribute to significant traffic problems and air quality. The City Planning Commission recommendation also would contribute to traffic and air quality impacts.

The social, economic and other considerations cited in Section D, below, render the 1986 SNCP a superior choice to the 1978 SNCP Alternative, the No-Project Alternative, the Blayney-Dyett Plan, or the City Planning Commission recommendation. These considerations outweigh the environmental differences between the other alternatives and the 1986 SNCP Plan.

D. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City Council has balanced the benefits to the South Natomas community and to the City as a whole against the risks of environmental damage disclosed in the EIR. To the extent that impacts have not been mitigated to acceptable levels, the Council finds the following specific economic, social and other considerations support adoption of the 1986 SNCP.

- 1. The 1986 SNCP, as it builds out, will result in a positive cash flow to the City in the form of taxes, payments to the Facilities Benefit District, and other fees caused by project construction and employment and increased land value.

2. The 1986 SNCP, as it builds out, will create new direct and indirect permanent jobs and temporary construction jobs with positive impacts on unemployment.

3. The conditioning of the individual projects will assure the City that the 1986 SNCP will result in projects that are well-designed and an aesthetic asset to the surrounding area and the City as a whole.

4. The office and business park areas of the 1986 SNCP, as it builds out, diversify the economic base, which is particularly needed in Sacramento at this time because of the limited growth in state and local government, which has in the past been the major Sacramento employer.

5. The office and business park areas of the 1986 SNCP as built out will result in the opportunity to capture major corporate head-quarter users which seek good access to downtown Sacramento, the airport, and major freeways.

6. The office and business park areas as built out will result in an opportunity to capture an important segment of the so-called "high tech" industries which are presently seeking new office locations in the Sacramento area.

DATED: JAN 28 1986


Mayor of the City of Sacramento

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

(2015.5 CCP)

*1/28/86
#47*

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

S.S.

County of Sacramento

I am the principal clerk of THE DAILY RECORDER, a newspaper of general circulation published in the City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Sacramento, State of California, under date of May 2, 1913, Case Number 16,180 that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than non-pareil) has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement therof on the following dates, to wit:

01/10

CIT, Ad #5858

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

R. Calvano

Signature

Dated JANUARY 10, 1986

THE DAILY RECORDER

1115 H Street, P.O. Box 1048
Sacramento, California 95805

(916) 444-2355

Mail Proof of Publication to:

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
City Clerk's Office
915 I Street, #203
Sacramento

(00299)

CA 95814

This space is for the County Clerk's filing stamp

CERTIFIED AS TRUE COPY

OF *Proof of Publication*

DATE CERTIFIED *1/29/86*

Louise Magana
CITY CLERK, CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY OF SACRAMENTO - ORDINANCES

On January 7, 1986, 1985, the following ordinances were considered by the Sacramento City Council. In accordance with Section 32, Sacramento City Charter, the titles are herein published:

ORDINANCES TO BE FINALLY CONSIDERED AT THE REGULAR MEETING OF January 14, 1986:

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the northwest corner of West El Camino Avenue and Orchard Lane from the Agriculture (A) zone and placing the same in the Single Family Residential (R-1 PUD) and Highway Commercial (HC-PUD) zone. (P-83397) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the north side of Garden Highway, approximately 500 feet west of Gateway Oaks Drive from the Single Family (R-1 PUD) zone and placing the same in the Office Building (OB-PUD) zone. (P-83398) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the west side of Northgate Boulevard, south of Turnstone Drive, from the Light Density Multiple Family (R-3 PUD) zone and placing the same in the Hospital (H-PUD) zone. (P-83401) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the west side of Northgate Boulevard, south of 1-80 from the Agriculture (A) zone and placing the same in the Office Building-Planned Unit Development (OB-PUD), Highway Commercial-Planned Unit Development (HC-PUD) and Single Family Residential-Planned Unit Development (R-1 PUD) zones. (P-83394) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the north and south sides of West El Camino Avenue, west of the Natomas Main Drainage Canal, from the Agriculture (A) zone and placing the same in the Shopping Center (SC-PUD), Townhouse (R-1A PUD) and Single Family Residential (R-1 PUD) zones. (P-83381) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the south side of I-80, approximately 2,500 feet west of Northgate Boulevard, from the Townhouse (R-1A) zone and placing the same in the Office Building-Planned Unit Development (OB-PUD) and Single Family Residential (R-1 PUD) zones. (P-83390) (D1)

Ordinance relating to Amendment of the Natomas Corporate Center Development Agreement (City Agreement No. 83034) (P-83333) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the north side of West El Camino Avenue, west of I-80, from the Garden Apartment (R-2B PUD) zone and placing the same in the Office Building (OB-PUD) zone. (P-83328) (D1)

lication of

Ordinance relating to amendment of the Natomas Eastside/Metropolitan Center Development Agreement (City Agreement No. 82054) (P-83328) (D1)

Ordinance amending Zoning Districts in the South Natomas Community Plan Area established by Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended and described in Section 1 (M-719) (D1)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at 4780 87th Street from the Single Family, R-1 zone and placing the same in the Townhouse, R-1A zone. (P-85448) (D8)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at 7484 Pocket Road from the Townhouse, R-1A and Agriculture, A zone and placing the same in the Single Family, R-1 zone. (P-85435) (D8)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located east of Franklin Boulevard, 3,000 more or less feet south of Ehrhardt Drive from the Agriculture, A zone and placing the same in the Single Family, R-1 zone. (P-84033) (D7)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at 5822 86th Street from the Single Family, R-1 zone and placing the same in the Townhouse, R-1A zone. (P-85402) (D8)

Ordinance amending the districts established by the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, as amended, by removing property located at the northeast corner of Florin Road and 24th Street from the Residential-Office, R-O zone and placing the same in the General Commercial, C-2 zone. (P-85452) (D7)

Res. authorizing Initiation Proceedings for the Morrison Creek Reorganization; Annexation to the City of Sacramento and Detachment from Special Districts: Florin Fire Protection District, Florin-Elder Creek Cemetery District, Southgate Recreation and Park District, Metropolitan Storm Drain Maintenance District and Pranzo zone of 53 acres of the 95 Acre Proposal Site to the Agriculture (A) Zone. (M-85091) (D6)

Ordinance establishing regulation and procedures for the removal of overhead utility facilities and the installation of underground facilities in underground utility districts. (Transportation and Community Development Committee)

Anyone interested in the full text of the above ordinances may contact the Office of the City Clerk, City Hall, 915 "I" Street, Room 203, phone (916) 449-5428.

Sacramento City Council, By: Lorraine Magana, City Clerk
Ad No: 5658
53021-January 10, 1986