

RESOLUTION NO. 87-107

ADOPTED BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO
ON DATE OF

December 15, 1987

CERTIFYING THE COMPLETION OF AND MAKING FINDINGS ON THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE DOCKS PROJECT

WHEREAS, an Environmental Impact Report (the "EIR") on the Docks Project (the "Project") was prepared by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento (the "Agency") pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., hereinafter "CEQA") and the administrative guidelines thereunder, (14 Cal, Adm. Code Section 15000 et seq., hereinafter the "CEQA Guidelines") and local procedures adopted by the Agency pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, notice to all interested persons and agencies inviting comments on the Draft EIR was duly published in a newspaper of general circulation; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was revised and supplemented in response to said comments, and the resulting Final EIR was prepared and submitted to the Council of the City of Sacramento (the "Council"); and

WHEREAS, after due notice, a public hearing on the Final EIR was held by the Agency on December 15, 1987, all interested persons present were heard, and the Final EIR and all comments and responses thereto were considered; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR, as revised and supplemented, incorporating all such comments received and the responses of the Agency and the Council, and as of this date is made a part of the Agency's Report on the Docks Project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

Section 1: The above statements are true and correct.

Section 2: The Agency hereby certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Docks Project has been completed in compliance with CEQA, CEQA Guidelines and local

RESOLUTION 87-107
DEC 15 1987

procedures adopted by the Agency pursuant thereto, and that the Agency has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Section 3: The Agency hereby makes the written findings set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein, for each of the significant effects set forth in said Exhibit A, and further approves the statement of facts set forth in said Exhibit A. Based on such findings and statement of facts, the Agency hereby finds that significant environmental effects have been reduced to an acceptable level in that all significant environmental effects have been eliminated or substantially lessened to an insignificant level, except that the development of the Docks Project as proposed would contribute to cumulative impacts, resulting in violations of the 8-hour carbon monoxide standards at the intersections of 3rd Street/Capitol Mall and 3rd Street/P Streets during the evening peak hour and unsatisfactory operation of the 3rd Street/P Street intersection during evening peak hours. Based on the foregoing, the Agency finds and determines that the Docks Project will have a significant effect upon the environment.

Section 4: As to the significant environmental effects identified in Section 3 of this resolution which are not eliminated or substantially lessened, the Agency hereby adopts the following statement of overriding considerations:

The Agency hereby finds that, based on the findings and statement of facts set forth in Exhibit A, and based on the Final EIR and other information contained in the record, its action to approve and carry out the Docks Project is supported because the Docks Project will, in furtherance of the adopted redevelopment plan for the area, (a) eliminate blighting influences and correct deficiencies in the Project Area, such as inadequate parking; (b) provide expanded public facilities; (c) generate permanent private sector jobs; (d) provide \$849,000 of annual revenues to local government; (e) strengthen the economic base of the Project Area and the community by installing needed site improvements which will stimulate new commercial and public facilities expansion, new employment and economic growth; (f) assemble land into parcels suitable for modern, integrated development with improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area; (g) increase the visitor-serving facilities and other commercial use and availability in the downtown area; (h) implement performance criteria which assure high site-design standards, environmental quality and other design element standards which provide unity and integrity to the entire Project site; and (i) increase tourism to Old Sacramento and the Docks area by providing for tour boat landing facilities and short term berthing for pleasure boaters.

Section 5: In the event that it is determined that the significant effects identified in Section 3 are not mitigated or substantially lessened, the Agency hereby finds that, based on

RESOLUTION 874107
DEC 15 1987

the Final EIR and/or other information contained in the record, its action to approve and carry out the Docks Project is supported for the reasons specified in Section 4 of this Resolution.

Section 6: Upon approval and adoption of the Docks Project by the Agency, the Secretary of the Agency is hereby directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of Sacramento County pursuant to the provisions of Section 15094 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Gene Keenan
CHAIR

ATTEST:

William H. Edger
SECRETARY

2110WPP1(14)
12/02/87

RESOLUTION 87-107(16)

DEC 15 1987

EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

1. Description of significant effect:

Land Use: The majority of the project will have to be changed through a zoning amendment or variance action to permit proposed uses.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Present M-1 (light industrial) zoning is a zone that has a great deal of flexibility with respect to types of uses. Proposed uses would be allowed through appropriate variance action.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

2. Description of significant effect:

Visual Quality: Visual character of project area would change. Hotel building would reinforce promenade effect on Capitol Mall.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

This significant effect is positive and consistent with the general area improvement.

The project meets goals and policies of planning documents relating to visual issues for area.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

3. Description of significant effect:

Historic and Cultural Resources: Likely that the project site contains deposits of cultural materials dating from 1840's to 1920's.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Historical research depicts a number of building sites previously occupied. Developers of projects must retain an archaeologist to protect potential archaeological resources.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

4. Description of significant effect:

Traffic and Circulation: The proposed project would contribute to increased traffic volumes at all intersections analyzed.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [X] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Left turn storage pocket on Capitol Mall at hotel is made a part of developers plan. MORT staff has been encouraged to provide daily shuttle operations and is planning to provide stop at MORT site. Most other proposed mitigations are under jurisdiction of other public agencies.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

5. Description of significant effect:

Air Quality: Construction activities would create a temporary increase in dust fall and therefore an increase in TSP near the construction site.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Any construction contracts must require watering in late morning and at end of day with frequency of watering increasing if wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

6. Description of significant effect:

Noise: Construction activities would temporarily generate high noise levels intermittently over the period of construction.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

All construction equipment and operations with a high noise potential must be muffled or controlled as feasible.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

7. Description of significant effect:

Hydrology and Water Quality: Project would significantly increase amount of impervious surface thus increase run off of stormwater.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [X] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Developer would be requested to examine feasibility of constructing a separate stormwater discharge system. City is presently selecting a consultant to examine sea wall. PG&E will be developing mitigation plans for their site related to hydrology, water quality and other aspects.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

RESOLUTION 87-107³⁾

DEC 18 1987

8. Description of significant effect:

Police Services: The Police Department would require an additional 1.36 sworn officers.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

Part of the increased general fund revenue from increased property taxes, sales taxes, and other public revenues could be used to partially offset the cost of officers and equipment as needed.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

9. Description of significant effect:

Public Revenues and Fiscal Impacts: Proposed project would generate a capital shortfall.

The Council finds that as to such significant effect identified above:

- [X] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect thereof as identified in the Final EIR.
- [] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- [] Specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The fact supporting this finding is as follows:

The capital shortfall would be balanced by the use of transient occupancy taxes and other revenues from the hotel and funds from the State of California.

This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Agency and Council.

2110WPP1(20)
12/1/87