(6)

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
Engineering and Transportation Division
915 I Street - Room 300
Sacramento, California 95814

June 13, 1984

Telephones (916)

Civil Engineering	449-5281
Electrical Engineering	449-5287
Architecture	449-5144
Construction	449-5281
Real Estate	449-5626
Traffic Engineering	449-5307
Parking	449-5354
Street Maintenance	449-5236

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Approving Negative Declaration for the Morrison Creek Deepening

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 April 1981, an Initial Study was performed. As a result of this study, it was determined that the Morrison Creek Deepening would not have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared. On May 24, 1984 the Negative Declaration was filed with the County Clerk. On June 1, 1984 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.

Respectfully submitted,

M. H. Johnson

M. H. JOHNSON
Director of Public Works

Recommendation Approved:

Walter J. Slipe

Walter J. Slipe, City Manager

14-E-040-15-0

June 19, 1984
District No. 6

6

RESOLUTION NO. 84-512

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

June 19, 1984

WHEREAS, on May 24, 1984 M. H. Johnson, 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:

MORRISON CREEK DEEPENING

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, Morrison Creek Deepening 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

deepening the creek channel by 6+ feet from Central California Traction Railroad east to Elk Grove/Florin Road and replace CCTRR wooden trestle.

4. That the Environmental Coordinator is authorized to file with the County Clerk a Notice of Determination for said project.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

JUN 19 1984

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

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:
   MORRISON CREEK DEEPING - DEEPEN CREEK CHANNEL BY 6+ FEET FROM CENTRAL CALIFORNIA TRACTION RAILROAD EAST TO ELK GROVE-FLORIN ROAD AND REPLACE CCTRR WOODEN TRESTLE.

2. Location of Project:
   MORRISON CREEK SOUTH OF FRUITRIDGE ROAD BETWEEN CCTRR AND ELK GROVE-FLORIN ROAD.

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.

Filed ENDORSED:
MAY 24 1984
JOYCE RUSSELL SMITH, CLERK
By Z. THOMAS, Deputy

DATED: MAY 21, 1984

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

By J. F. Varozza
J. F. VAROZZA,
Director of Public Works

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL
JUN 19 1984
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

C.C.# 2516

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

INITIAL STUDY

References are to California Administrative Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 7, Section 15063

1. Title and Description of Project (15063 (d)(1))

   MORRISON CREEK DEEPENING FROM CENTRAL CALIFORNIA TRACTION CO. RAILROAD EAST — DEEPEN MORRISON CREEK CHANNEL BY 6+ FEET AND REPLACE CCTRR WOODEN TRESTLE.

2. Environmental Setting (15063 (d)(2))

   THE PROJECT IS LOCATED IN A HEAVY INDUSTRIAL (M-2) ZONE.

3. Environmental Effects - Attached checklist must be completed by person conducting initial study (15063 (d)(3))

4. Mitigation Measures - Attached list of mitigation measures must be completed by person conducting initial study (15063 (d)(4))

5. Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans (15063 (d)(5))

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

Date MAY 21, 1984

Fawett D. Campbell
(Signature)

Title ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal wave?	X		
4. Plant Life. 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)?			X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?			X
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?			X
d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?			X
5. Animal Life. 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)?			X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?			X
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?			X
d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?			X
6. Noise. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in existing noise levels?	X		
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?			X
7. Light and Glare. Will the proposal produce new light or glare?			X
8. Land Use. Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?			X
9. Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?			X
b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?			X
10. Risk of Upset. 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
11. Population. Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?			X
12. Housing. Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?			X
13. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?			X
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?			X
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?			X
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?			X
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?		X	
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?			X
14. Public Services. 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?			X
b. Police protection?			X
c. Schools?			X

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. 2516

Date: MAY 21, 1984

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project MORRISON CREEK DEEPENING - EAST FROM CCTCo RR

2. City Department Initiating Project PUBLIC WORKS

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 1965 FLOOD & DRAINAGE FUND

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

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

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

1.b. DEEPENING THE MORRISON CREEK CHANNEL WILL RESULT IN DISRUPTION AND COMPACTION OF THE SOIL.

1.c. THE DEEPER CHANNEL WILL INCREASE THE CAPABILITY OF MORRISON CREEK TO HANDLE SURFACE WATER RUNOFF.

3.b. THE PROJECT WILL ALLOW MORRISON CREEK TO HANDLE A GREATER VOLUME OF RUNOFF

3.c. FLOOD WATERS WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE AREA FASTER.

3.i. THE HAZARD OF FLOODING OF PROPERTY WILL BE REDUCED.

6.a. DURING CONSTRUCTION, THE EXISTING NOISE LEVEL WILL BE INCREASED AS A RESULT OF THE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT TO BE USED.

13.e. DURING REPLACEMENT OF THE TIMBER TRESTLE, RAIL TRAFFIC ON THE CCTRR LINE WILL HAVE TO BE REROUTED.

14.e. THE DEEPER CHANNEL WILL INCREASE THE DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS TO KEEP THE PROPER DEPTH.

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

1.b. NONE

1.c. NONE

3.b. NONE

3.c. NONE

3.i. NONE

6.a. NOISE POLLUTION WILL BE MINIMIZED BY RESTRICTING CONSTRUCTION TO THE NORMAL DAY LIGHT WORKING HOURS AND ENSURING THAT ALL CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT IS PROVIDED WITH PROPER MUFFLING DEVICES.

13.e. CENTRAL CALIFORNIA TRACTION CO. WILL BE DOING THE TRESTLE REPLACEMENT THEMSELVES; THEREFORE, THE EXTENT OF DISRUPTION OF THEIR RAIL LINE WILL BE A FUNCTION OF HOW QUICKLY THEY CAN REPLACE THE TRESTLE.

14.e. MAINTENANCE OF THE CHANNEL DEPTH MAY BE EASIER BECAUSE THE CHANNEL UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM IS DESIGNED FOR THE INCREASED VOLUME OF RUNOFF, THUS PRESENTING LESS CHANCE FOR SILTATION.

	Yes	Maybe	No
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	—	—	X
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	X	—	—
f. Other governmental services?	—	—	X
15. Energy. 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. Utilities. 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. Human Health. 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. Aesthetics. 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. Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	—	—	X
20. Archeological/Historical. Will the proposal result in an alteration of a significant archeological or historical site, structure, object or building?	—	—	X
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance.			
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)

NO PROJECT – THE AREA WOULD REMAIN IN THE EXISTING CONDITION WITH THE UPSTREAM CHANNEL TRYING TO FEED A GREATER VOLUME OF RUNOFF INTO THE PROJECT SECTION THAN IT CAN HANDLE. THE RESULT IS THAT THE POSSIBILITY OF FLOODING THE AREA IS GREATER WITH THE EXISTING CHANNEL DEPTH

VI. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

[X] 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 21, 1984

Gareth D. Bushell
(Signature)

Title ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT