



2

DEPARTMENT OF  
GENERAL SERVICES

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

5730 - 24TH STREET  
BUILDING FOUR  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95822-3699

916-449-5548

DIVISIONS:

COMMUNICATIONS  
FACILITY MANAGEMENT  
FLEET MANAGEMENT  
PROCUREMENT SERVICES

June 30, 1988

Budget and Finance Committee  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

**SUBJECT: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FUELING FACILITY AT THE 24TH STREET CORPORATION YARD**

SUMMARY

Fleet Management Division is requesting the establishment of a new Capital Improvement Project for the construction of a fueling facility at the 24th Street Corporation Yard. The new facility is necessary because of the following: 1) extensive contamination was found as a result of the tank testing program; 2) the tanks and lines were already scheduled to be replaced during Fiscal Year 1988/89; 3) current and future fueling demands needed to be addressed; and 4) the facility will provide safer access to the Corporation Yard while improving overall efficiency. The total cost of the project is estimated to be \$556,842.00 and will be paid for from funds in Fleet Management's Contingency Reserve.

BACKGROUND

During the routine testing of the four (4) 10,000 gallon tanks at the 24th Street Corporation Yard, a leak in a product line was detected. Due to the emergency nature of potential contamination, Fleet Management proceeded to remediate the problem based on prior Council approval.

Upon initial excavation, contamination appeared to be more extensive than expected and construction was halted. At this time, it was found that an old abandoned line was the source of the major contamination. To determine the extent of all contamination, the services of EarthTec, a geotechnical engineering firm, was obtained. EarthTec conducted subsurface exploration to depths of 25

feet which showed contamination existed between the two fuel islands. EarthTec estimated 150 - 200 cubic yards of soil would need to be excavated, requiring a complete shutdown of the service station.

In order to remediate the site and remove the contaminated soil as soon as possible, the services of Walton Engineering, a local petroleum expert, were obtained to provide Fleet Management with options and costs to:

1. reconstruct the existing fuel site; and/or
2. build a new fueling facility at the Yard

### ANALYSIS

Due to the age of the 24th Street Corporation Yard's fuel tanks, (two of the tanks were installed in 1956) the City's five (5) year Removal and Replacement Program, adopted by the City Council on May 21, 1987, scheduled the replacement of these tanks in Fiscal Year 1988/89. This plan only considered the replacement of tanks and lines; however, with the discovery of extensive contamination it now became necessary for Fleet Management to proceed with a more extensive remediation than originally planned. (Note: After a complete cycle of testing and implementation of daily reconciliation, the 24th Street Corporation Yard was the only facility found to be in need of extensive repairs. A detailed report on the Underground Storage Tank Program is being prepared and will be presented to Council in the near future.)

Based on Walton Engineering's study, the following considerations were evaluated:

#### 1. Site and Equipment Obsolescence:

- The existing site is well over 30 years old and environmentally unsafe.
- Equipment is obsolete and dispensers cannot cost effectively be retrofitted to accommodate the proposed computerized card system planned for the fuel island.
- The canopy at the existing fuel island has a height of 12'-0" and would have to be replaced to accommodate fleet vehicles having 14'-0" heights. On a number of occasions vehicles have hit the canopy beams. Additionally, the canopy only covers two dispensers and offers little protection during inclement weather.

#### 2. Poor Design:

- The existing facility is restrictive during peak fueling hours as the arrangement and type of dispensers limit the number of fueling points, and cause back-up traffic into the major access road of the Yard.

- Safety hazards exist at the islands and the surrounding driveways because the current design does not restrict vehicles from entering or exiting from either direction.

### 3. Downtime:

- Upgrading the current facility would require a minimum of 60 days downtime; whereas, a new facility could be phased in while the existing facility is still in operation. Once the new facility is in partial operation, the old facility will be closed.

Although the costs for upgrading the existing facility is estimated to be \$14,400 less than building a completely new facility, (See Exhibit I) the following benefits will be realized:

- reduction of downtime from 60 days to less than 10 days;
- the opportunity to redesign the facility to meet user needs;
- the ability to address safety hazards by realigning the entrance to the Corporation Yard and providing safer access in and out of the Yard;
- the furnishing of new state-of-the-art service station equipment addressing the environmental requirements set forth for underground fuel tanks;
- the provision for equipment to accommodate methanol fuel;
- ease of installing a new computerized fuel management and security system.

Based upon the above mentioned benefits and due to the emergency nature of remediating the 24th Street Yard, plans and specifications were prepared for a new facility and will be submitted to Council.

A Negative Declaration was also prepared for this project by the Public Works Engineering Division, and is being submitted to Council concurrent with this item. No objections to the new facility were raised. (See Exhibit II)

### FINANCIAL DATA


The cost for the construction of a new fueling facility is estimated to be \$556,842.00. This includes construction costs, inspection fees, in-house project management costs and related contingencies. Sufficient funds are available in the Fleet Management Contingency Fund which has a current balance of \$1,815,000.

RECOMMENDATION:

After thoroughly examining the current and future needs of the user departments based at the Corporation Yard, and ever mindful of the environmental concerns and regulatory mandates regarding underground storage tanks, Fleet Management is therefore requesting the Budget and Finance Committee to forward this report to the City Council with recommended approval of:

- the establishment of a new Capital Improvement Project for the construction of a fueling facility at the 24th Street Corporation Yard, and the transfer of funds from the Fleet Management Contingency Reserve, in the amount of \$556,842.00.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Frank Mugartegui  
Director of General Services

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

  
Jack Crist  
Deputy City Manager

July 12, 1988

Attachments

FM:88102:RM/rg





FILED

APR 18 1988

JOYCE RUSSELL SMITH, CLERK

By *L. Boylin*  
DEPUTYDEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WORKS

ENGINEERING DIVISION

THOMAS M. FINLEY  
ENGINEERING DIVISION MANAGERCITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA927 TENTH STREET  
ROOM 200  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2705

916-449-8220

CONSTRUCTION SECTION  
640 BERGUT DRIVE  
SUITE B  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-0131

916-449-5282

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

April 13, 1988

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:

24th Street Corporate Yard Fueling Facility - Demolition, removal and treatment of existing soils for fuel contamination in conjunction with relocation and expansion of fueling station.

## 2. Location of Project:

5730-24th Street

## 3. The Proponent of the Project: City of Sacramento

4. It is found that the project will not have a significant affect on the environment. A copy of the initial study is attached, which documents the reasons supporting the above finding and any mitigating measures included in the project to avoid any potentially significant effects identified in the initial study.

5. The Initial Study was prepared by David L. Morgan.

6. A copy of the Initial Study and this Negative Declaration may be obtained at 927-10th Street, Room 200, Sacramento, California 95814.

THOMAS M. FINLEY  
Environmental Coordinator,  
Public Projects

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))

24th Street Corporate Yard Fueling Facility

Demolition, removal and treatment of existing soils for

fuel contamination in conjunction with relocation and

expansion of fueling station.

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

All lots surrounding the project site are zoned R-1.

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))

This project is compatible with the general plan of the City of Sacramento and maintains consistency with current facility operations.

Date April 11, 1988

  
(Signature)

Title Project Manager

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
INITIAL STUDY  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

C.C. No. N/A

Date: April 11, 1971

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name of Project 24th Street Corporate Fueling Facility
2. City Department Initiating Project General Services
3. Name of Individual Preparing Checklist David L. Morgan
4. Is Checklist Being Prepared for CEQA X or NEPA     ?
5. Source of Funding of Project To be determined

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

	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>Y</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>Y</u>
h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	—	—	<u>X</u>



	Yes	Maybe	No
1. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal wave?	—	—	X
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)?	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. <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)?	—	—	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. <u>Noise.</u> Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in existing noise levels?	—	—	X
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	—	—	X
7. <u>Light and Glare.</u> Will the proposal produce new light or glare?	X	—	—
8. <u>Land Use.</u> Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?	—	—	X
9. <u>Natural Resources.</u> 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. <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
11. <u>Population.</u> Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?	—	—	X
12. <u>Housing.</u> Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?	—	—	X
13. <u>Transportation/Circulation.</u> 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. <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?	—	—	X
b. Police protection?	—	—	X
c. Schools?	—	—	X

	Yes	Maybe	No
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

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

- 1.b. - Extensive excavation will be required to remove existing tanks and contaminated soil.
- 1.c. - Slight topographic changes will be required during relocation of fueling station. This expansion will require relocation of existing drain inlets.
- 2.b. - After completion of the project there may be objectionable odors in the direct proximity of the pumps during fueling, but the problem will be restricted to the immediate parcel and should not present a problem for owners of adjacent parcels.
- 4.a. - Several trees will be relocated to adjacent landscape areas as a result of this project.
- 7. - New lights will be installed in the canopy above the pump island. The lights will be shielded to reduce glare to adjacent parcels.

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

- 1.b. - Soils will be maintained in a damp condition during construction to reduce dust.
- 1.c. - Existing lawn area will be reconfigured and leveled for A.C. paving surrounding gas island.
- 2.b. - Due to separation of construction from adjacent parcels odors should not present a problem off-site. A vapor recovery system will be installed to reduce emissions and odors.
- 4.a. - The city Arborist will work with construction crews and a tree relocating service to save all existing mature trees and maintain a landscape buffer between the fueling station and 24th Street.
- 7. - Lights specified for the canopy over the pumps will be installed in cutoff fixtures to reduce glare.

- 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)

The size of the fueling station is dictated by current and  
projected demand for the facility. The number of islands will  
reduce current stacking problems.


Site configuration and projected traffic flow inside the  
Corporation Yard will decrease on-site traffic congestion  
and reduce vehicle hazards.

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 April 11, 1988

  
(Signature)  
Title Project Manager



DEPARTMENT OF  
GENERAL SERVICES

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

June 30, 1988

5730 24TH STREET  
BUILDING FOUR  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95822-3699

916-449-5548

DIVISIONS:

COMMUNICATIONS  
FACILITY MANAGEMENT  
FLEET MANAGEMENT  
PROCUREMENT SERVICES

City Council  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 24TH STREET CORPORATION YARD FUELING  
FACILITY

SUMMARY

This report recommends the approval of a Capital Improvement Project for the construction of a new fueling facility at the 24th Street Corporation Yard; the transfer of funds from the Fleet Management Contingency Reserve; and the approval of specifications and plans.


BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE ACTION

The attached report was approved by the Budget and Finance Committee at their meeting of July 12, 1988.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the attached resolution approving the project.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Frank Mugartegui  
Director of General Services

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

Walter J. Slipe  
City Manager

July 12, 1988  
All Districts

Attachment  
FM:88103:RM:rg

# RESOLUTION NO.

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

June 12, 1988

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT  
FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FUELING FACILITY AT THE  
24TH STREET CORPORATION YARD, THE TRANSFERRING OF FUNDS,  
AND THE APPROVAL OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO THAT:

1. The 1988/89 Capital Improvement Program is amended by the addition of a new project titled "24th Street Corporation Yard Fueling Facility"; and

2. Funds be transferred from the Fleet Management Contingency Reserve

420-710-7012-4999	\$ <u>556,842.00</u>
-------------------	----------------------

to the Fleet Management CIP Project - "24th Street Corporation Yard Fueling Facility" (to be distributed as follows):

420-500-XXXX-4820	\$ <u>351,396.00</u>
420-500-XXXX-4414	\$ <u>55,368.00</u>
420-500-XXXX-4840	\$ <u>150,078.00</u>
TOTAL	\$ <u>556,842.00</u>

3. Approve the Plans and Specifications to construct the new fueling facility.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK